

1.

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives the House will convene in five minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members will please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy Service this day. Amen. It was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said: Character is higher than intellect....A great soul will be strong to live, as well as to think. Let us pray. Almighty God, Creator and Maker of all mankind; we thank Thee for the blessings of this life which Thou hast bestowed upon us; for the privilege of serving in this House of Representatives. Enable us, we beseech Thee, with Thy power from on high to show for Thee in all that we are to do emulative qualities that mark us with distinction, concerned love, and perseverance for truth as we serve the people of the State of Illinois. We ask this in the Name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll be at ease until 2 o'clock. I understand that there's some problems in getting here from Rockford and from Tinley Park and Oak Lawn and South Holland andElk Grove Village. Okay. I understand thatNo, they can get here from Bensenville. Joliet, there's a little problem there. I said that we were going to be at ease so I think maybe we ought to do that, Jack. Two o'clock, yeah. Right on the button. They're socked in in Peoria. (At ease.) The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Roll Call for attendance. Constitutional Amendments, First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment 37. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the



electors of this state for adoption or rejection at the next general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IX, Revenue; Section 4, Real Property Taxation (a). Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provided by law. (b) Subject to such limitations as the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law, counties may classify or continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable and assessment shall be uniform within each class. The level of assessment or rate of tax of the highest class in the county shall not exceed two and one half times the level of assessment or rate of tax of the lowest class in that county. Real property used in farming in a county shall not be assessed at a higher level than assessment than single family residential real property in that county. (c) Any depreciation in the value of real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property. (d) the Growth Incentive Option. Any home rule municipality may designate certain specific areas within its boundaries to be taxed on the basis of site value, without regard to the value of improvements. Immediately upon the designation of such an area, each taxing district involved shall thereafter fix its tax rate on improvements in the designated area at zero and fix its tax rate on land in the designated area equal to the product of the real property tax rate of the taxing district times a conversion factor, which will thereafter remain constant, equal to the ratio of the aggregate assessed value of all taxable real property in the designated area divided by the aggregate assessed value of all taxable land in the designated area. Taxation of designated areas under this option shall con-



tinue for 12 years, but may not be extended without limit as long as any such extensions are for no less than 12 year periods. First reading on the Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Hall: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman for the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken November 7, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do Pass' House Bill 2479."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2513, Kelly, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2514, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Local Government Affairs, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Approval of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Journal for Monday, October 24, 1977, 4 o'clock...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journals number 92 and 93, of October 24 and 25, 1977, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'. Representative Madigan.Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Journals are approved. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative McGrew is excused because of the illness of his son."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, the record will so show. Are there any excused Republican absences? Representative Madigan, do you move to recess the Regular Session until after the convening of the First Special



Session? The question is on this motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries.....

The Hour of 1:10 having arrived, the First Special Session will come to order. Representative Madigan for the purpose of a motion on the Roll Call."

Madigan: "I move that the Roll Call for the First Special Session be the Roll Call for attendance for the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the records will so show. Approval of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for Monday, October 24, 1977, 2 o'clock P.M....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journals number one and two of October 24 and 25, 1977, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Journals are approved. House Bills, Second Reading, House Bill 21."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 21, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State's Attorneys Appellate Service Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Madigan, for the purpose of a motion to recess the First Special Session until after adjournment of the Regular Session."

Madigan: "So moved."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The



motion carries. The First Special Session stands in recess until after the adjournment of the Regular Session.

The hour of 1:20 having arrived, the House will come to order on the Second Special Session. Representative Madigan for the purpose of a motion. Roll Call?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Roll Call for the Second Special Session be the same as the Roll Call for the attendance of the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the motion. Representative Mudd.Dynamic duo."

Mudd: "I just wanted to have the floor for a request after this, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. No objection, the Roll Call on the Regular Session be used on the ...as a Roll Call on the Second Special Session. Hearing no objection, it will be so ordered. Now, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as vice-chairman of the Executive Committee I would like to have leave to suspend the appropriate rule ...posting rule, so that House Bill 2497 might be heard tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, in Executive."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the subject matter of the Gentleman's motion is not part of the Second Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "I think another problem is that that's in the Regular Session and we're in the Second Special Session. The Bills to which you refer is in the Regular Session, Representative Mudd. Approval of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Journal for Monday, October 24, 1977, 2:30 o'clock, p.m., at a Special Session of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, begun and held in the House of Representatives, in the City of Springfield, on Monday, October 24, 1977, at the hour of 2:30 o'clock p.m.,



the Honorable William A. Redmond, Speaker, called the House to order and pursuant to the following...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journals number one and two of October 24 and 25, 1977, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries, and the Journals are approved. House Bills, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any motions with respect to those Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 5."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 5, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board to the Department of Corrections, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments #1 and 2 were withdrawn in Committee. Floor Amendment #3, Barnes, amends House Bill 5, on page one by deleting Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment was up the other day and as we know was inadvertently acted upon and in essence, as I explained the other day, the only thing that I am attempting here is to put in the language in House Bill 5,



is essentially the same language that now rests in House Bill 4, as it relates to the bonding authorization. House Bill 5 is for funding of that authorization and this Amendment merely attempts to put into that Bill the same similar language that's in House Bill 4, and the bonding authorization, which would not preclude any of the existing proposal sites from being constructed, but it would not exclude any of the sites being constructed within the State of Illinois. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I first want to say that I appreciate Representative Barnes' willingness to withdraw this the other day when it was called untimely. I will have to oppose this Amendment for several reasons. In the first place the Governor appointed the Committee after he announced that there were going to be prisons constructed. They spent over three months going over this state and accepting bids from any community that wanted it. It took a lot of their time and they finally concluded these two communities were the ones where the prison should be built. Planning has already begun, preliminary planning. Options have been taken on the site and anything of this nature, while it might not include those two sites, certainly would open it up to where the Governor would have to go through the whole process again and the need for prison space is very much in need right now. So I would respectfully ask you and with all respect to Representative Barnes, to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Barnes? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment #5. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 42 'aye' and 82 'no'. The motion fails. 8.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 6 on Third Reading.....Second Reading, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill #6, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act of 1972. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee:"

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to that Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 amends House Bill 6, as amended, on page one, by deleting line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of Amendment 2? Representative Leverenz. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 would expand the Capital Development Bonding Authority by approximately the 15 million dollars to pick up projects in the Bill for the Capital Development Bill where the authorization was not there last spring."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to have to oppose this Amendment and also would point out that the Governor's Office opposes it as does the Capital Development Board. In the original authorization Bill it included not only the prisons but a number of things for Mental Health, Children and Family Services, Department of Conservation and Joliet Metropolitan Exposition Authority and so on, but I think the danger is that this is about to become a Christmas tree and it.....certainly there'd be no end to it because we all have projects. But CDB singled out the projects that are in House Bill 6 as the ones who are needed at this point. So that this



thing does not get out of hand I would respectfully oppose Representative Leverenz's Amendment. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect.... Representative, I understand that it is not necessarily opposed and I'd ask for the House to accept Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 54 'aye' and 74 'no', and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Leverenz, amends House Bill 6, as amended, on page one by deleting line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof....and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and Representative Friedrich. This Amendment, I understand, is more acceptable. It includes one project and that is the Triton College Project for 6.8 million dollars. The House passed this as part of the Capital Development Appropriation and the authorization Bill was lower when it....in the final action from a Conference Committee. I understand that there is an okay to go ahead with this project now. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I still will have to oppose his Amendment on the same grounds as before, that this has not been approved by CDB or the Governor's Office because of the availability of funds. So I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment



#3. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 46 'ayes' and 74 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on Committee Amendment #1?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Oh, that's right. We don't vote on the adoption...on the Committee Amendments on the floor. Unless you file a motion with respect to it. Ain't no way. Anything further? Representative Martin."

Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I please have leave to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 5, Amendment #3?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has asked leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on Amendment #3 to House Bill 5. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. Are we ready for recess? Representative Madigan... recess motion."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what is your pleasure as far as an agreement...."

Speaker Redmond: "Recess ...Second Special Session until after adjournment of the First Special..."

Madigan: "So moved, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Second Special Session stands in recess until after the adjournment of the First Special Session."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan...Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the motion that I made a little while ago was out of order because we weren't on that order of business, but I'd like to renew my motion to suspend the



posting rule so that we can hear 2497....House Bill 2497, in Executive, at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now, we didn't get ...back to.. we haven't actually gone back to the Regular Session. I think, before that motion should be put, we should go back to....."

The House will now be in order in the Regular Session of the 80th General Assembly. Now Representative Mudd's motion, with respect to asking leave to hear House Bill 2497 in Exect, tomorrow, is that correct? Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to waive the posting rule in order to hear House Bill 2450, in the Counties and Townships Committee tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, in room 122 B."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Representative Madigan. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, have we concluded with the suspension of the posting requirements for Counties and Townships in Executive?"

Yourell: "I thought we did. Yes."

Madigan: "At this time, Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.....to introduce a new Member. Seated in the rear, on the Democratic side, is new Representative Robert Walsh replacing the former Representative O'Daniel Bob served during the ...during the 1963-1965 Session of the House of Representatives and as Dan Pierce just stated, he was a blue ribbon candidate and on behalf of the House, I wish to welcome him back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Gentlemen, it's certainly a pleasure to get back. I



notice quite a few changes that have been made in the make-up of the House. The main outstanding one that I see is that the Members are so much younger than they used to be. So.....I'm looking forward to serving with you and I will certainly appreciate your help and I'm sure that any suggestions that you have, I will be very happy to listen to them and I'm interested in working with you to best serve the interests of the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, simply to provide against the contingency that we need a suspension of the rules, I now move that the posting requirement be suspended to provide for a meeting of the Committee on Motor Vehicles, tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., to consider House Bill 2435, which was deemed exempt by the Rules Committee this morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "That the one we had this morning? No, I have no objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, the rule will be suspended to permit the hearing tomorrow, is it? Okay, tomorrow morning, okay. Anything further? House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading, 2461."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2461, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2462."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2462, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation in relation to State Employees Deferred



Compensation Plan, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2463."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2463, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to State Finance, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to that Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2470."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act making a supplemental Appropriation to the Department of Transportation, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1,2,3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to those Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Leverenz, amends House Bill 2470, as amended, on page 1, by inserting after Section 2.1, the following, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 would have matched the authority in the other Bill. This would fund the Triton Project as the Capital Development Bond Bill was sent out of here last spring and I ask that the Amendment be adopted and we go from there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Leverenz, didn't we just reject an Amendment to the Authorization



Bill that would have provided for this project?"

Leverenz: "In the House we just lost Amendment #3 which would have provided the authorization for this 6.8 million dollars. That's correct. Senator Rock intends to try for the same thing in the Senate."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of this Bill I would have to object to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in...or, the adoption of the Amendment, those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 35 'aye' and 66 'no', and the Gentleman's motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Kozubowski, amends House Bill 2470, as amended, on page one, by inserting immediately after Section 1, the following....Section 1.1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 would add an appropriation of 7.5 million dollars for phase one land acquisition for the Loop Junior College in the City of Chicago. I move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, as the Sponsor of this Bill I will have to object to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Cunningham: "Representative Kozubowski, is this the same Bill that was vetoed by the Governor...twice? Senate Bill 496."

Kozublowki: "You're correct."



Cunningham: "And isn't the ultimate cost projected for 40 billion dollars rather than 7.5 as indicated. That's just what shows at this point, isn't that true?"

Kozubowski: "As I indicated in my presentation, Representative Cunningham, this is phase one and the initial appropriation is 7.5 million dollars. As far as I know there has been no actual determination as to what the total cost will be."

Cunningham: "Some have argued that any money spent for education is worthwhile, but there has to be a limit on what the taxpayers can bear. In this particular instance you're phasing 40 million dollars of money that the State of Illinois doesn't have. The Governor has had the courage to stand up and veto it. We have our individual responsibility to our constituents to take as equally fiscal responsible position. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Amendment. The reason why Representative Kozubowski is required to stand before us today and offer this Amendment is because of miscalculation, misinformation, misdeed by the Capital Development Board. CDB has worked on this project for approximately ten years, on and off, off and on. The time has come to stop shortchanging those residents of Chicago who need this facility. It's very easy for all of us to sit here and to say, 'well, we need this and we don't need that'. There's been a demonstrated need for the construction of this community college in Chicago for at least ten to fifteen years and I think it's time that we came due on our promise."

GIORGI IN CHAIR.....

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in regard to



Representative Kozubowski's motion on this particular item on appropriation. As everyone knows, on the floor of the House, I've been fairly active in handling a lot of the Capital Development Bills. I think, this year, we've seen on appropriation, many add ons come out for Capital Development projects that we had legislation on last year and this year both that were either vetoed or killed in Committee by different people from across the aisle. Now, since we go back into appropriations and we consider only those Amendments that were introduced by Republican Members, even to the tune of 15 or 30 million dollars, add ons, to those Capital Development Bills, and bonding authorization. Now we're going to stop college improvement that the Capital Department has been considering for a period of years and if we don't add it on with the rest of these construction units this year, at the rate of increase of inflation you can see what this project is going to cost in the future. I think we ought to go ahead with this Amendment and approve the authorization for this Loop College in Chicago so that we don't have to pay two or three times as much next year when we go in for a bonding authorization to raise the level. So I would ask everyone to support this and I support it even though it isn't in my district. I don't want to spend extra amounts of money next year when we do approve it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative, can you tell me the long-term cost on this? I realize that we're talking about seven and a half million now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just a minute, Mr. Ryan. Mr. Kozubowski indicates he can't hear Mr. Ryan. Please repeat the question, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Representative, can you tell me what the long-term costs



are? What is it...what is the ultimate cost of the Loop Junior College or whatever it is you're going to call this thing?"

Kozubowski: "Well, Representative Ryan, as I indicated to Representative Cunningham's question originally, this is phase one of the project. The cost is 7.5 million dollars for initial land acquisition. The total cost of the project has not yet been determined."

Ryan: "Well then, Representative, I understand that it has been determined and we're talking about some 40 million dollars."

Kozubowski: "I'm not aware of the figure of 40 million dollars."

Ryan: "Well, if you'd like to take this out of the record at the time I'd be glad to show you the figures, if you'd like to take it out now?"

Kozubowski: "No."

Ryan: "I mean....I think that you ought to be responsible enough to have the exact figures, Representative, to know how much this is going to cost. The 7.5 million dollars..."

Kozubowski: "I don't think that is pertinent to the Amendment before the floor of the House right now. We're talking about the initial project, phase one, land acquisition. We're not talking, in this Amendment, about the total projected cost of the project."

Ryan: "Representative, how can you expect this Assembly to put their authorization on an item that they have no idea what the total cost is going to be? I'm talking about 7.5 million dollars for land acquisition and you don't know what you're going to do with it after that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, here we stand before you one final time, talking on behalf of the junior colleges in the City of Chicago. These colleges do a yeoman's job in educating people who would not otherwise get an education. There are those of you from the other



side of the aisle who are constantly crying 'why don't you do something about reducing welfare, why don't you do something about this that and the other'. We are attempting to perform the number one function of a society to educate its young. I think that the seven million dollars is a reasonable and a cheap figure for land acquisition in the City of Chicago. That's all that we're talking about. If we must address ourselves to the possible other thirty to possibly forty million dollars that might be spent that is correct. But I should like to point out to you when we vote a 250 million dollar appropriation to the University of Illinois, we hear not a whimper. I say to you that the junior colleges are a valid system in the State of Illinois. They educate the most kids for the least dollars and they do deserve our support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to Representative Ryan's question of Representative Kozubowski as to the land for which this money is asked. My response to Representative Ryan is that he ought to consult with Mr. Glickman, the Executive Director of the Capital Development Board who is seen quite frequently hovering close to his desk. Because Mr. Glickman has worked on this project every since he joined the Capital Development Board after leaving Speaker Blair's Staff. You know the plan for this school. You've seen it several times and I think it's an affront to all of us to be attempting to embarrass Representative Kozubowski. Public knowledge....Mr. Glickman, from the CDB knows the answers, call him on the phone right now, he's available."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I wish to call the attention to the colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this school is being built so that it can accommodate all of those babies you voted



last week that the ladies will have to have. So now if you're sincere about wanting to take care of all of those babies, you better vote for this school so they can be educated when they get grown."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Ryan, do you wish the floor again?"

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Madigan's comments warrant a reply. I would think that everybody in this body would want to know how much...what the ultimate cost of this is going to be. It's 40 million dollars and when you put the debt service on it it's 70 million dollars. We don't know where the land is here. We don't know how long they're going to sit on it. We have no idea. I'd like to have 7.5 million dollars for Kankakee County too. Maybe we can get the Representatives to put that in a Bill...in an Amendment...and get his support to do it. I think this is crazy to be acting on an Amendment like this and I certainly would hope that we could defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry...Mr. Speaker and I hate to play this roll but I have a question as to whether or not this Amendment is germane to the Bill. Mr. Speaker, the copy of House Bill 2470, that I have, says that this is an appropriation from the road fund to the Department of Transportation for use by the Department of Law Enforcement. I just don't see the germaneness of that....if I'm reading the same Bill. I don't see the germaneness of this Amendment to that Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Madison, I'm informed that it is germane because it is an appropriation Bill and all appropriations can fit into this appropriation."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just a moment, Mr. Madison. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "To answer Representative Madison's inquiry. If he



would examine Amendment #2 to this Bill he'll see that the title of the Bill has been changed."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Madigan."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kozubowski to close."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In closing, I would just add to the debate that the Governor vetoed this section of the Bill originally and he gave us his reason the fact that there wasn't the necessary authorization. Well, presently under House Bill 6, that authorization is there and if we're going to keep our commitment to quality education and to the students in Cook County and the City of Chicago, I would urge you to adopt this Amendment. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Amendment #6 to House Bill 2470 be accepted? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mann to explain your vote."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is a long time commitment for the construction of this particular school and in prior years we have been put off and off and off and off and the need is demonstrable. The students are there and if in fact our goal is to make as much higher education as possible available you may find yourself coming in, in a subsequent Session and asking for funds that you want to build in some parts of the state. I think that you'll find cooperation if you will help us in this particular instance. So I urge you to cast an 'aye' vote here for quality education and do it right now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 72 'nays', one voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #7, Leverenz, amends House Bill 2470,



as amended, on page one, by inserting Section 21 and the following."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the same reason we adopted Amendment #6, rather than take the time of the House, I ask for the adoption of 6.6 million dollars for the Triton College project which was in the CDB authorization Bill...the appropriation Bill and for the problem...or the authorization Bill...we lost it at that point. We have another opportunity to put it here where we voted for it last spring."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cunningham on the Amendment."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the precedent cited is not the right one. This is on all fours with Amendment #5 that you had rejected. The reason you rejected #5 was that there was no bonding authorization. Now the Sponsor finally acknowledged that there's no bonding authorization here for this particular expenditure. There is no basis whatever for voting for this particular Amendment. The prior Amendment that we had on 6, there was bonding authorization. You need to ask yourself whether or not it's a futile gesture to continue to vote for these Bills that will just be vetoed. Somewhere along the line we'll have to have a Second Veto Session for the Bills that were passed during the consideration of the first round of vetoes. The circle is never ending. The Governor isn't going to sign this, he isn't going to sign the prior Amendment that we just passed. I urge you to vote 'no', and the reason that you vote 'no' is to be logical and consistent in that there's no bonding authorization for this particular Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Bluthardt, on Amendment #7."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor to



yield to a question or two."

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "This is an Amendment that deals with Triton College in our district, isn't that right? Triton College Amendment?"

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir, that's correct."

Bluthardt: "What is the purpose of the 6.6 million?"

Leverenz: "To build a vocational technical part on the east side of Fifth Avenue..."

Bluthardt: "And has Capital Development Funds been used in the past to acquire the land on which they propose to build this building?"

Leverenz: "Partly and partly from the school."

Bluthardt: "Could you tell us how many millions of dollars that have been expended by Triton College with this in mind?"

Leverenz: "I didn't understand your question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Repeat your question, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Do you know how many millions of dollars has been spent by Triton College and by the Capital Development Board with the purpose in mind of constructing this building?"

Leverenz: "Roughly, I understand, a million and a half, to this point."

Bluthardt: "I understand though, it's been going on for years... and that the promises have been held out that the funds would be available for the construction of that building. Is that correct?"

Leverenz: "That is correct. The project did not go in the 75-76 CDB Bill because there wasn't any, it lost. The authorization Bill lost. This time we're putting it back in as we did in the spring and for the same partial problem, the authorization Bill was about 30 million under in authorization, I understand that that will be prepared and we do need this Amendment."



Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in behalf of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Proceed, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "You know, this is.....in a minor scale, similar to the Loop College Amendment that was just adopted. Triton College did acquire this land some years ago at a considerable expense to the taxpayers of the Triton College district, which happens to be mine, as well as Mr. Leverenz and Mr. Williams. They have been assured, in the past, that money would be available to construct the building. Each year, thought, that it's been appropriated it has been vetoed by the Governor. It sits there, the land is there, some..... And I think it's about time that we did give them the additional help that they are asking for and help the Triton College, which happens to be the largest community college in Illinois. I would ask you to support this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, Representative Bluthardt, you are entirely correct. This project happens to be standing #1 on a community college board list of priority projects. It has, for the last couple of years, lost for one technical reason or another. It is the finalfinal, I add, part of their building program. They have almost a million dollars in their working cash fund, tied up at this point....and if it goes on any further from here we'll end up going through the engineering and planning processes all over again. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Amendment #7 to House Bill 2470 be adopted? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 70 'nays', 2 voting 'present', and this Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk Hall: "Amendment #8, Kent, amends House Bill 2470, as Amended by the title, by deleting the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following..."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Amendment is to appropriate \$44,417 out of the Land and Water Fund. These funds will be expended in a grant to the railroad to cover the installation of the railroad crossing signal at the DesPlaines Conservation Area. This is approved by the Conservation Department. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment #8 be adopted? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed by saying 'no'. ...All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'.... the opposed 'no'! The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Is Representative Stuffle here....for 2484? 2489? Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2489, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Industrial Commission, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions or further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions or further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Is Lechowicz here, on Amendment #.....I mean on House Bill 2492?"

Unknown: "Matijevich will handle it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Matijevich will handle it. Representative Matijevich on House Bill 2492."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2492..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2492, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Secretary of State, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Giorgi: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. House Bill 2494. Will you read it, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2494, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the office of State Appellate Defender, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed, no further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. House Bill 2495."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2495, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Madigan, for what reason do you arise?"

Madigan: "Point of information. Has this Bill been printed, House Bill 2495?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Has House Bill 2495 been printed, is the question?"

Madigan: "Has it been printed?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2495, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. At the direction of the Speaker, he wants to move to Total Veto Motions on page 7 of your Calendar of today. We're done with the House Bills, Second Reading and with the deadline tomorrow on vetoes he thought we ought to go to Total Veto Motions, on page 7. On Total Veto Motions there appears House



Bill 245, by Davis. Representative Davis, on House Bill 245."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe the Governor has erred in his Total Veto of House Bill 245. His Veto Message indicates the possible defect in the legislation that deals with the question of what constitutes a second or subsequent conviction of the Controlled Substance Act. And while it could be argued that his point is well taken I believe an Amendatory Veto clarifying that particular Section would have been more in order than a Total Veto. I further believe that the judicial process can determine the intent of the language of this Section and if not, the law could be further amended to clarify this point in subsequent amendatory legislation, next Session. The Governor's Veto Message further states that the intent of increased penalties for drug convictions would be salutary to the Special Session on crime that is currently being addressed by the General Assembly. By this, I assume he meant that the idea of increasing sentencing for this heinous crime would fit right in to determine sentencing proposals that are currently under consideration. I submit to you that that may well be the case, however, the General Assembly thought enough of the idea of the deterrent value of increased second or subsequent conviction drug Class 1 felonies, to increase the penalty from four to ten years on a minimum basis, that it passed this House by a 148 votes to 12, I believe, and the Senate by 44 to 4 or 5. I believe the General Assembly wants to deal more harshly with this crime of death and poison, dealing on its merit, because the General Assembly recognizes the drug sales manufacturing and distribution is a root crime that seeds the great number of street crimes to fund its habit. I therefore respectfully urge you to vote 'yes' on this veto override."



Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Kelly, on the motion."

Kelly: "Yes, I would like to ask the Sponsor of the motion a question."

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he'd answer."

Kelly: "Jack, can you tell me if this Bill is the one where there are....if a convicted drug pusher is convicted twice of pushing a dangerous quantity of drugs, then he would get....what would the sentence be on this particular law?"

Davis: "Under the present law it's increased from...on a Class 1 felony, from a minimum of four years to a minimum of ten years."

Kelly: "Uh-huh. And then, in effect, really that this particular Bill is a mandatory, flat term, prison sentence Bill which certainly preceeds the 'Crime X' or the other proposals which are before us?"

Davis: "Yes."

Kelly: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker....and Members of the House, I rise in support of Representative Davis's motion to override the Governor on House Bill 245. I certainly feel that this is the first time, in my opinion, that the Governor has been faced with a law which is, flat term mandatory prison sentences. The first opportunity that he had to address this subject, he took a negative approach. Now I think that Representative Davis has a very excellent Bill. This is very similar to Bills which I sponsored in 1973 and in 1975. This is a Bill which passed this House of Representatives by 148 to 12 and I think the Governor made a grave mistake in vetoing and total vetoing a Bill which concerns mandatory prison sentencing, because I can't see how he can be in favor of 'Crime X' control legislation on one hand and on the other hand veto a law which, in effect, would be mandated prison sentences. I ask for your support, to join me and Representative Davis, in overriding the Governor."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kempiners on the motion."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "The Governor's Veto Motion of this Bill indicates that his concern is a lack of clarification in the Bill, as to what constitutes a second conviction. The example he gives is, an undercover agent who has already made a small purchase....making a second small purchase and then the case is going to trial on two counts and he indicates it's not clear whether or not that could be counted as a subsequent conviction. Would you please state your intent in this....in the proposal this Bill as to what you mean by two convictions?"

Davis: "Representative Kempiners, in my opening remarks I did indicate that there probably is some ambiguity here that was addressed on that point. It probably should have been clarified by an Amendatory Veto rather than Total Veto. I am not an attorney, I do not know. I would say this to you that I believe the judicial process."

Kempiners: "Pardon me for interrupting. But what I'm trying to do, I plan on voting for your motion but I just think that you ought to put into the record what your intent, as the Sponsor of this Bill is, in case there is a..."

Davis: "In that specific instance my intent would be to read into the Journal that that indeed would be a second offense. I don't think we can deal too harshly with this crime. I don't think it can be interpreted too harshly."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Willer on the motion."

Willer: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Willer: "I'm sorry I don't knowdon't remember the full substance of this Bill. Would you please tell me what drugs are covered? I see it's just certain sections or certain types."

Davis: "It's the Controlled Substance Act, Representative Willer."



Willer: "Anything that's listed as a controlled substance?"

Davis: "Yes. It amends that particular provision of the Criminal Code."

Willer: "That's amphetamines.....the whole bit?"

Davis: "The whole, hard-core Controlled Substance Act, yes."

Willer: "Wow."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski on the motion."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the motion?"

Speaker Giorgi: "You certainly may."

Kosinski: "It's been obvious to those of us who are close to crime and to the crime problems that one of the basics... I repeat, one of the basics for many of our felonies has been drug addiction. Armed robberies occur through a need. Burglaries occur through a need. Even knocking down that little old woman and stealing her purse occurs through need. And that need, in a great number of situations, is the need for narcotics. I have the necessary amount of human compassion and when a man is in once for this problem, possibly he should get some consideration, but on a second offense, when we realize this is a basic for many, many other felonies, I think we must become harsh. I subscribe to this override motion and I won't vote for it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Brummer on the motion."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Yes, Representative Davis, I noticed on Section 581, paragraph 2, that reads, 'As amended, in which case the maximum term shall be at least ten years'. Is that a typographical error in there. You mean minimum term?"

Davis: "No. There's two sections in there that deal with minimum, maximum sentencing and the Bill had to be amended in both sections to reflect a tentative Bill, which was a minimum, absolute minimum section.....er..sentence of ten years."



Brummer: "Yes, line 21 of the Bill, it indicates....a maximum term shall be at least ten years. It would appear that the word 'minimum' is meant in there rather than the word 'maximum'."

Davis: "Well, this came up during the discussion on the Bill in Committee and the Reference Bureau and all the Attorneys who huddled on the Bill decided that the Bill had to be amended that way for the intent of the minimum sentence to be at least ten years. It had to be amended in both Sections to be consistent with the Bill itself...er with the Legislation itself."

Brummer: "You have both a minimum and a maximum tenure?"

Davis: "Well, I'm finding it difficult to explain this to you, Rich, simply because it is...it establishes a minimum but the maximum shall be no less than ten, which establishes a minimum. That's the reason both Sections, if you go... I don't have the Bill in front of me. If you go back to the earlier Section you'll find that the Section dealing with minimum is on page one, I believe, and both Sections to be consistent, had to be amended. Trust me, Rich."

Brummer: "I'll have to, I can't understand it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, on the motion."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Would this minimum ten year sentence apply to, say, a kid who got hooked on drugs and then was forced by his or her supplier to go out and peddle drugs to their friends in order to maintain their own supply?"

Davis: "Second and subsequent convictions."

Kane: "It would apply to those. It wouldn't apply only to the original pushers who are making the money off this?"

Davis: "The Bill applies to anyone manufacturing, distributing or selling, Representative Kane. And if unfortunately, the person that is hooked is forced into a sales situation, he is a pusher. I don't know how to deal with that. I don't



know how to accept people. What is an addict. So consequently it deals with everyone in the manufacturing, distribution and sales of controlled substances."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Robinson on the motion."

Robinson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Robinson: "Could you explain how this would effect those convicted for marijuana violations."

Davis: "It has no effect on it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Well, I think a lot of questions have been answered.

I hope it clarified the issue before the General Assembly. This is probably one of the worst, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, root crimes, seed crimes that exist today and I think we should do everything we can to discourage it. I therefore would urge you to get on the ball here and let's override this veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 245 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay' and it'll take three-fifths majority, 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, would you care to explain your vote?"

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't understand the reluctance of this Body to go with a motion of this type, on the basis of its prior vote and on what the Governor called the 'salutory' effects of this particular Bill. They are salutary, they are dealing with one of the most violent and vicious forms of death dealing on our streets today. I urge you please, in my explanation of my vote of 'aye', to join me in this increase in sentencing."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 votes....'aye' votes, 15 'nay' votes, 14 'present' votes. Yes, Sir, just a moment, Mr. Cunningham. For what reason do you arise,



Representative Cunningham?"

Cunningham: "I'll wait until you've made your announcement of the vote and then I'll ask the question, a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 245 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Representative Cunningham on your inquiry."

Cunningham: "Does this vote indicate that the House feels that the Governor is soft on crime in favor of coddling criminals who.....what is the Speaker's opinion on this?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I say take an excerpt out of today's Journal and publish it. For what purpose does the Lady from Lake County arise, Ms. Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly, I regret the prior comment of the prior speaker. I think it's unnecessary. We all know the Governor's very strong against bad people and I don't think your comments are well taken at all as much as I love you."

Speaker Giorgi: "On the Calendar appears Total Veto Motions to House Bill 375, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. Representative Holewinski onOut of the record. Representative Beatty, on House Bill 654...651, pardon me, House Bill 651, Total Veto Motion by Representative Beatty. Read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move that House Bill 651 'do pass' veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Beatty on the motion."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a pure pay-raise Bill. It was voted through by this House previously. It provides a pay increase for arbitrators of the Illinois Industrial Commission and the Secretarial Industrial Commission from \$25,000 to \$34,000. It further provides a pay increase for the chairman of the Industrial Commission, to go from 32,000 to 38,000 and for the other four members



of the Industrial Commission to have their pay raised from \$30,000 to \$36,000. The total cost of this Bill is \$270,900. Now there's a very definite need for this pay increase. We've discussed this previously. The Bill in its first form had other changes but we've got it down to a point where it's just a pay raise Bill. The members of the Industrial Commission, the arbitrators, the chairmen and the members of the Secretary are not able to practice law or earn any other income as the result of being lawyers. They are, under the law, required to act only in the capacity of members of the Industrial Commission. And it is not tied in with judges salaries. There's no changes of title. These men are arbitrators, they are members of the Industrial Commission. They cannot earn any other money as lawyers other than in this capacity. To show you how other people feel about this I have letters of endorsement of this Bill from the Illinois Manufacturer's Association, the Chicago Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association, the AFL-CIO, the State AFL-CIO, the National Advocate Society, anyone at all in a judgment position relative to these gentlemen feel that in their capacity they should be given adequate funds for the work that they are doing. They had a pay raise Bill last...sometime early in 1974. They have fallen behind. The men are processing many hundreds of claims. They are a full time position. They work from nine in the morning until sometime after four o'clock in the afternoon. I believe that these men should be given a pay raise and I'd appreciate your support for this. I'd be glad to answer any question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson on the motion."

Johnson: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Johnson: "Do these individuals have to be lawyers, Mr. Sponsor?"



Beatty: "Well, the fact of the matter is, there are one or two arbitrators who are not lawyers now. With relation to this, I think that this is fine. I don't think a person has to be a lawyer in order to judge the extent of an injury under Workmen's Compensation. I'm glad that laymen have an opportunity...."

Johnson: "My question was, do they have to be lawyers?"

Beatty: "No...but they have to have....they have to have certain qualifications..."

Johnson: "Well...ah..."

Beatty: "They have to have experience in this type of activity. They have to pass a Civil Service Exam."

Johnson: "What kind of professional training do they have to have....Do they present or have to have a degree in this sort of work or do they....can they do it on a high school degree or what training do they have to have to qualify for this position?"

Beatty: "Well, we actually set standards in this Bill so that we get qualified people for these positions. Whatever standards are set by the Industrial Commission, those are the standards that the Department of Personnel will set for these people as the new people come into this job. Incidentally, Mr. Johnson, with the openings, another.... just last Friday, another member, a Commissioner, was appointed a judge and there's another opening. These openings ...these are all going to be filled by your Governor.. He's got three of these top positions and I understand that the salary provisions would be much better for new people coming in. You'd be able to attract better talent by giving these people more money."

Johnson: "What was the date that the last pay raise was granted these particular class of individuals?"

Beatty: "Well, it was September 1, 1974, the effective date."

Johnson: "What was the amount of that increase?"

Beatty: "The arbitrators went from \$21,000 to \$25.....I'm not



sure what the Commissioners went to. They got about a four or five thousand dollar increase....probably."

Johnson: "And this Bill would represent a fifty percent increase in three years, is that right?"

Beatty: "I don't think your mathematics is correct."

Johnson: "Well, from 25 to 37....that's a fifty percent increase, right?"

Beatty: "They're not going to 37, from 25 they are going to 34."

Johnson: "Okay. Okay. What, do you happen to know just off-hand what the cost of living increase has been in the last three years?"

Beatty: "I don't know what it's been. I know...I know that as a Legislator I'm making a lot less money than I did before and I think the Legislature along with a lot of other people need increases and I'm sure that this Bill will start the ball rolling so that all of us can get some consideration."

Johnson: "Well, I guess my question is, does this Bill, if overridden, reflect an increase in salary more than, less than or the same as the cost of living increase since their last pay raise?"

Beatty: "Well, let's compare it to the state employees. At the level that these gentlemen are at, they've fallen ... they have fallen far behind those of other similar employees. When you go back to August of '71, if you compare these people's salaries with other people at the state level, these gentlemen have fallen way behind."

Johnson: "Well, the point is, the cost of living hasn't gone up as much as your proposed Bill would allow their salaries to go up. Isn't that right?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson, do you want to address the motion now?"

Beatty: "Well, I'm not sure about that question, Representative. I know that they have fallen behind and originally, when



these men took the job, they were able to practice law, and since they got into these jobs, we've changed the law. So I don't think you can really compare. You're comparing apples with oranges. They were able to practice law when most of them were put in and subsequently the Legislature, before you arrived on the scene, said 'no, it's better that these men have a certain salary and devote their full time to it!'"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson to address the motion."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just briefly, on the Bill. It's obvious that this increase is significantly more than the cost of living increase seen over the last three years. Mr. Beatty made a good point, we're....this is going to set the terms for future increases for public employees, including the General Assembly. I've been an opponent of those increases in the past and I think that we've got an obligation in the year of fiscal austerity to set the tone for other's relative increases and to prevent breaking the taxpayers of Illinois by paying public employees more and more and more money. And I think this is an area that....to stop the increase....we can stop it in a number of other areas and I would strongly urge your 'no' vote on this motion to override."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bennett on the motion."

Bennett: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. And it's a very simple reason. If we really want to see, right now, some reforms, some reform of the Illinois Workmen's Compensation Act, this is where we must begin. We hear all kinds of comments concerning the need to improve our business climate, the need to change the Illinois Workmen's Compensation system. If we can ever make a major change to the betterment of the system it's this way. These men that serve as arbitrators have to really make decisions



on a day by day basis and in each day, over more hours than most judges, involving literally tens of thousands of dollars per day. They have to make rulings on the law, they have to almost be medical experts in order to determine...in order to determine what is due someone who is injured on the job. And in order...the kind of person that we need in this job, we must pay a reasonable and decent living wage. I have seen, personally, these ... these men, up and down the state, work twelve to fifteen hours a day, five days a week and sometimes six days a week in order to comply with the requirements of their job. It's time that we recognize, this is the place to begin. This is where we can make a major start in improving the Illinois Workmen's Compensation System. I think it's a good Bill and it should pass."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mautino, on the motion."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 651 is an important step in the right direction. I have some reservations mainly because this Commission has been without a chairman since July of 1977...and I think this is ...it is with this position to put all of the workers who are possibly injured in industrial accidents in the State of Illinois into a.... it is a very disadvantage ...position to put them in because most of these arbitrators and in fact those that I know personally and I recommend most highly to every Member of this chamber that they attend some of these hearings, are handling between four and five hundred cases a day. The load has gone from approximately five thousand cases to better than twelve....fifteen thousand cases per hearing officer. What I'm saying to you is that if in fact we are having decisions made that amount to tens of millions of dollars, these people must be well informed in the medical area as well as in the decision making process of a very complicated law which



very few of us understand. First and foremost there are not enough hearing officers itself to handle the case-load. I have some reservations, as I said, concerning the salary increase for the Chairman, but the arbitrators out in the field, throughout the State of Illinois, certainly deserve and need this if they are going to reform the system and have equitable decisions made. I agree totally with Representative Bennett that this is needed legislation and I would hope that we would all look at it in the complex position that it is within our Statutes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen on the motion."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll try to be very brief and will be brief. I would just like to support what Representative Bennett and Mautino have said without being repetitious and also I think that the argument, as expressed by Representative Johnson, has no validity because he talks about, you know the percentage of increase on the cost of living and I just think, in looking back to whatever time element it was '73 or '74, these jobs were underpaid at that time. Representative Mautino has just indicated to you the tremendous increase in the workload and the added responsibility that we have ...that these jobs demand and I certainly think that this type of a raise, without even knowing who these people are, just the responsibility of that job merits us to get the qualified people to take them and also to retain those good ones that you do have. I certainly would encourage everybody to support this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer on the motion."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address myself to the Bill. I think too many of us are begging the issue on this particular Bill. We're talking about the need of these particular individuals, for a pay increase



but we're not realizing the all too apparent fact that if we start giving spot pay increases to different people in our system at the present time we're going to continue this inflationary spiral, if you will, in our own spending policy. Now the Governor of this State has set up a Commission which is reviewing the salary of other state employees, legislators, judges, et cetera. That particular Commission has not reported back yet. I do not think it would be proper at this point in time to single out one group of employees and give them a pay raise under any circumstances, even if they deserved it. But I personally feel that this is one group of people that probably don't deserve it. Everyone of them are political appointees, with practically no experience. It is probably the worst organized phase of government and although the system might not in and of itself be corrupt, I am positive in my own mind that there is corruption to such a degree, in the Workmen's Compensation field that the Bar Association should be completely disgusted with their lack of their own ingenuity and ferreting out the attorneys who are on their take in this type of business. Now the Commissioners have a responsibility of determining who these men are and yet they continue to perpetuate this type of thing in the Chicago area particularly where a small handful of attorneys go in and handle all of the Industrial Commission cases. They do this and get away with it because they were before, prior political appointees who are now locked into their job because of Civil Service. I believe we only have one course to take in this, and that is to postpone any consideration of pay raises for these people until the Governor's Commission has reported so that all employees, no matter what their position, or what their political clout, can be considered at the same time....and while that is going on, hope that the Bar Association and the Supreme Court of this can look into



some of the corrupt legal practices that are going on before our Industrial Commission, which are not helping one person, one laborer or one taxpayer."

Speaker Giorgi: "Members of the House, the Illinois Information Service would like to shoot some film here....so they are going to be on the floor of the House and up in the balcony. Representative Houlihan on the motion."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Representative Beatty's motion....And in speaking in support of that motion, I would like first to address, what was a question raised by Representative Johnson about arbitrators' salaries and the cost of living increase. The fact is that the arbitrators' salaries have not kept up with the increase in the cost of living. In August 1971, United States Bureau of Labor Statistics and Consumer Price Index, U. S. city average, was 122.1. By August of 1976 it has risen to 171.9 an increase of 40.8 percent. During the same period, however, arbitrator salaries increased by only 16.3 percent. More than 25 percent behind the increase in living costs. Representative Beatty referred to what has taken place as far as comparable state employees in labor grade 26 and labor grade 27. In 1971 in labor grade 26, they were at a level of \$20,700 and in 27 at \$22,392. Today, they are at \$30,360 and \$32,784. In consequence, what they realize is an increase of over 46 percent as compared with arbitrator's increase of only 16 percent. So the blunt fact is that arbitrators' salaries have nowhere kept near with the pace as far as other states or comparable state employees are concerned or with the cost of living index. The fact is that the industrial Commission, last year, processed more than \$140,000,000 in claims in the last fiscal year and future increases in the claims volume are obviously inevitable. The arbitrator, even at this proposed salary level of



\$34,000 is the least costly and the most important instrumentality in the delivery of benefits to the working man of this state. The Illinois system works because of the skill and the integrity of the arbitrator. If the Commission is to continue to attract qualified arbitrators, salary levels must be commensurate with responsibility. Now I would like to point out, because there seems to be some confusion in the staff analysis, particularly on the Republican side, as to the salary levels that are proposed here being tied to judicial salary. As the Bill was originally introduced, that was correct. However, in the form that it passed this House and passed the Senate, that is not correct. These are in no sense tied or related to judicial salaries. What is clear, however, is that the salary level that we're talking about here for this semi-judicial position, is substantially below that of full circuit judges, who are at \$42,500 and also below that of associate judges at \$37,500. Now this is a very reasonable proposal. It effects only twenty arbitrators, four commission members, a chairman and a secretary. Now we know how important the Workmen's Compensation Act is to this state. Because we have spent considerable time these past two to three legislative years on legislation in that area. This Bill, as modified, in the form that it passed both houses of this legislature, is supported, as is this motion of an override, supported both by labor and by management, as indicated in the letters from the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the Chamber of Commerce, the State AFL-CIO, and there was various bar associations. I think it's extremely reasonable. I think that the need here is very severe, if we are to have a qualified industrial commission. Since their last pay increase these men are prohibited from any other outside income. Nineteen of the twenty arbitrators in this state are attorneys and



they are prohibited from a private practice. The fact is that you will not get qualified people and you certainly won't get attorneys unless you will raise these to a reasonable level commensurate with what their duties and responsibilities are under the Act. I join Representative Beatty. I hope that you will join him also in this very reasonable motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in light of this lawyers boondoggle, I move the previous question."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and Representative Beatty to close."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House...Members of the House, this is a \$270,000 is all that this Bill adds up to and it makes up for some need that has existed for a number of years. If you're going to have people handing out, under awards of the Industrial Commission, substantial sums of money they should be adequately compensated. Contrary to what you have heard, these Gentlemen have taken Civil Service exams...Civil Service exams...they were appointed after being tested. These men are members of no political parties, they come in under Civil Service. Back about 1968 the majority of those now sitting in Chicago took exams and they were graded after having years of experience in dealing with this type of work. They are somewhat of an expert in handling medical, quasi legal medical problems and they deemed qualified and put in. Subsequently, since that time, the Governor of both parties have put people in after giving them examinations. This ...in order to be an arbitrator you do not have to be an attorney. I think that's good. The field is open for anybody who is qualified. I ask for your favorable support."



Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 651 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take three-fifths vote; 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my vote; Ladies and Gentlemen I think this topic has been well covered. The importance of this matter may not be apparent to everyone but the simple fact is that we are not going to have well qualified, responsible arbitrators who administer millions of dollars of Workmen's Compensation Funds unless we are willing to pay salaries that are commensurate with the responsibilities and duties involved. Simply because we passed one pay increase does not mean that we have to pass other pay increases. I think that is crying wolf unnecessarily. This is a well deserved, needed Bill. I urge more 'aye' votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Represent...Representative Griesheimer to explain your vote."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Chairman, I'll ask for a verification if this goes over 107."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Beatty on House Bill 651."

Beatty: "I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk, in a moment. The Clerk will poll the absentees, when he's ready."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Byers, Conti, Daniels, Edgar, Gaines, Hoffman, Hudson, Jaffe, Keats, Levin, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew, Pullen, Schlickman, Schneider, Schuneman, E. G. Steele, Totten and Wall."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten indicates he wants to vote 'aye'. Harold Byers wants to vote 'aye'. Representative Dave Jones, 'aye'. That's Byers, Totten and Jones."



Clerk O'Brien: "Jones 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Say that again."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jones was 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Jones was from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Griesheimer, do you persist in your motion?"

Griesheimer: "I do."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gaines wants to vote 'aye'. For the purpose of the verification will all unauthorized members please leave the floor? Everyone take their seats. Mr. Griesheimer on the motion."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a standing verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Tipsword on the motion of the oral verification, I presume?"

Tipsword: "I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Tipsword: "Do we still have verification?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I suppose that's always in order."

Tipsword: "I thought we followed precedence?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Refresh my memory. What was precedence?"

This will be an oral verification unless there are objections. Okay, Mr. Clerk, proceed with the oral verification. Members please be in their seat and answer the Roll Call. Clear the Board, please. Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, I don't know that he has that option after we've already taken the Roll Call. I think that's up to the Speaker and I think that since we've already...of course you dumped it now....so...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Matijevich, we've decided to proceed with an Oral Roll Call. Will the Members please signify 'aye' and hit the button.....when the Clerk calls your name."

Unknown: "You can't overrule Zeke."

Unknown: "You're overruled, Zeke."

Speaker Giorgi: "Begin."



Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Abramson 'aye'. Adams..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Bowman..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Did Adams vote? Adams, 'pass'. Anderson..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Adams voted 'no', but go continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams 'no'? Adams 'no'. Anderson 'aye'.

Antonovych 'aye'. E. M. Barnes 'pass'. Jane Barnes 'no'

Bartulis ...Bartulis 'pass'. Beatty 'aye'. Bennett 'aye'.

Birchler 'aye'. Bluthardt 'present'. Boucek 'no'.

Bowman 'aye'. Bradley 'aye'. Brady 'aye'. Brandt 'aye'

Breslin 'aye'. Rich Brummer 'aye'. Don Brummet 'aye'.

Byers ..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Byers 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell 'aye'. Campbell 'no'. Capparelli

'pass'. Catania 'no'. Chapman 'aye'. Christensen 'aye'

Collins 'pass'. Conti...Conti 'pass'. Collins votes

'present'. Cunningham 'no'. Daniels 'present'. Darrow

'aye'. Corneal Davis 'aye'. Jack Davis 'aye'. Dawson

'pass'. Deavers 'no'. Deuster 'no'. DiPrima 'aye'.

Domico 'aye'. Doyle 'aye'. John Dunn 'present'. Ralph

Dunn 'present'. Dyer 'no'. Ebbesen 'aye'. Edgar 'no'.

Epton...Epton 'pass'. Ewell 'aye'. Ewing 'no'. Farley

'aye'. Flinn 'aye'. Friedland 'no'. Friedrich 'no'.

Gaines 'aye'. Garmisa 'aye'. Geo-Karis 'aye'. Getty

'aye'. Giglio 'aye'. Giorgi 'aye'. Greiman 'aye'.

Griesheimer 'no'. Hanahan 'aye'. Harris 'aye'. Hart

'aye'. Hoffman...Hoffman 'pass'. Holewinski 'aye'.

Dan Houlihan 'aye'. Jim Houlihan 'aye'. Hoxsey 'no'.

Hudson...Hudson 'pass'. Huff ...'aye'. Huskey...Huskey

'pass'. Jacobs 'aye'. Jaffe 'aye'. Johnson 'no'. Dave

Jones 'aye'. Emil Jones 'aye'. Kane...Kane 'aye'. Katz

'aye'. Keats 'no'. Kelly 'aye'. Kempiners...Kempiners

'present'. Kent 'no'. Klosak 'aye'. Kornowicz 'aye'.

Kosinski 'aye'. Kozubowski 'aye'. Kucharski 'pass'.

Lauer 'no'. Laurino 'pass'. Lechowicz 'pass'. Leinenweber

'aye'. Leverenz 'aye'. Levin 'pass'. Lucco 'aye'.



Luft 'aye'. Macdonald 'no'. Madigan 'aye'. Madison 'pass'. Mahar 'no'. Mann 'aye'. Marovitz 'pass'. Lynn Martin 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin 'pass'. Matejek 'pass'. Matijevich 'no'. Mautino!...He's not in this Roll call. I'll get back to Matula when he...I'll come back to you. You're out of place in this Roll Call..... Mautino 'aye'. McAuliffe 'no'. McAvoy 'present'. McBroom 'present'. McClean 'aye'. McCourt 'aye'. McGrew '...McGrew 'pass'. McLendon 'aye'. McMaster 'no'. McPike 'aye'. Meyer 'present'. Miller 'no'. Molloy 'aye'. Mudd 'aye'. Mugalian 'aye'. Mulcahey 'no'.... Murphy 'aye'. Nardulli 'aye'. Neff 'no'. O'Brien 'aye'. R. V. Walsh 'aye'. Pechous 'aye'. Peters 'no'. Pierce 'aye'. Polk 'pass'. Porter 'present'. Pouncey 'aye'. Pullen 'pass'. Reed 'no'. Reilly 'no'. Richmond 'aye'. Rigney 'no'. Robinson 'aye'. Ryan 'pass'. Sandquist 'aye'. Satterthwaite 'aye'. Schisler 'aye'. Schlickman 'pass'. Schneider 'pass'. Schoeberlein 'aye'. Schuneman 'no'. Matula 'aye'. Sharp 'aye'. Shumpert 'aye'. Simms 'aye'. Skinner 'no'. Stanley 'present'. Stearney 'present'. Steczo 'aye'. E. G. Steele 'pass'. C. M. Stiehl 'no'. Stuffle 'aye'. Sumner 'present'. Taylor 'aye'. Telcser 'no'. Terzich 'aye'. Tipsword 'aye'. Totten 'no'. Tuerk 'no'. Van Duyne 'aye'. Vitek 'aye'. Von Boeckman 'aye'. Waddell 'no'. Wall '...Wall 'present'. Von Boeckman voted 'aye'. Walsh, W. D. 'aye'. Wikoff 'pass'.....Wikoff 'no'.. Willer 'aye'. Williams 'aye'. Winchester 'no'. Wolf 'pass'. Younge 'aye'. Yourell 'aye'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Polk, for what reason do you arise?"

Polk: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Polk: "Vote me 'aye'."



Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Polk 'aye'. Gene Barnes, for what purpose do you arise? ...Vote Gene Barnes 'aye'. Representative Duff...wants to vote 'aye'. I'm sorry, Representative Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Which Dunn?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Ralph."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin, P.S.: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as not voting."

Martin, P.S.: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Peggy Smith Martin 'aye'. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jesse Madison 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anybody else want to change your vote?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

Representative Beatty, for what reason do you arise?"

Beatty: "I'd like to have this placed on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Does he have leave? Leave's been granted. The Bill is on Postponed Consideration. Representative Birchler on ...out of the record. Representative Holewinski on House Bill 806...out of the record. Representative Hoxsey on House Bill 978, ...out of the record. House Bill 1109, Collins. On the Calendar appears...under Total Veto Motions appears House Bill 1109, Representative Collins. House Bill 1109."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1109 is a simple Bill which I was frankly somewhat surprised to find vetoed. All this Bill does is it brings some consistency to our Campaign Disclosure Act and establishes the same aggregate level of \$150 for transfers between political Committees as it pertains to contributions and expenditures. The Governor



in his message, said that the 85 percent of these transfers historically would exceed the \$150 level anyway and I would think that this is the level that we are aiming at. Besides that my motivation in putting the Bill in was the ruling of the State Board of Elections which would say that a contribution from one campaign to another would be a transfer of funds such as if Representative Giorgi's Committee made \$100 contribution to my Committee, I would think it would be a contribution and an expenditure, it is not. It's a transfer and therefore it would have to be disclosed no matter what the dollar level. I think that this is inconsistent and in the name of consistency alone I think the Bill should be passed. It is a bipartisan effort. It was Sponsored by me and Cosponsored by Representative Bluthardt, Madigan and Laurino. So there is no effort to....to slip anything through here. There is no effort to do anything harmful due to the disclosure Act. I would ask for the favorable consideration of this override."

Speaker Giorgi: "On the motion, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "It's very seldom I rise to agree with the Sponsor of this motion but he's absolutely right. I found out thatI think one of the reasons why, as the Governor points out, only 85 percent of transfers are in excess of \$150 is because most of us didn't know that transfers between political committees of less than \$150 were required to be disclosed. I didn't know until it was brought to my attention and I had to amend every report I ever ...I've ever filed because of the fact, for example, if one of your colleagues happens to buy a ticket to your fund raiser for \$7.50 or \$10 or so and uses his own campaign funds for that, that's a transfer and must be filed in your...and must be itemized in your disclosure forms. I think it was an oversight and the Sponsor of this motion who Sponsored the Bill, indicates it was an



oversight because he didn't know that you had to report those either, when I asked him about it. So I certainly feel that in line with the Sponsor's original intention, when he helped pass the original disclosure Act that we ought to clarify this issue. I think it's reasonable and appropriate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I can't improve upon Representative Leinenweber's explanation. I would merely ask for your favorable vote on this motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1109 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins to explain his vote."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just informed that Representative Giorgi says that that contribution from his campaign fund to mine would be a miracle and nothing less. In spite of that, that was the motivation for the introduction of this Bill, as indicated by Representative Laurino. It seems utterly inconsistent that people who would buy a ticket for \$7.50 such as Representative Leinenweber indicated, would have to list that transfer in a campaign...disclosure report when a contribution or expenditure or receipt has to arrive at the aggregate total of \$150 before it has to be reported. I think, in the name of consistency that we should strike the \$150 aggregate at that level or more realistically raise the transfer up to \$150. This Bill, I think, is just common sense and I would really appreciate one more vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 37 'nays', 5 voting 'present', this motion having received



the Constitutional three-fifths Majority prevails and House Bill 1109 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 1185, Ms. Geo-Karis. Representative Jaffe for what reason do you arise?

Your Bill? House Bill 1185, Representative Jaffe on a Total Veto Motion."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I really think that it is sad that the Governor vetoed this particular Bill. As you probably know this is the redefinition of rape a Bill that passed out of this House by a vote of 146 to 1. It was the work of three years of a bipartisan Committee and I think it is really a realistic approach to a very difficult product....subject. Let me say this first of all. We tried to do several things with this particular Bill. I think we tried to redefine rape. We tried to make proof easier in the crime of rape. Also what we did and I think the thing that the Governor primarily objects to, unfortunately, is the fact that we made two different classifications of rape. Rape and aggravated rape. Now this body well knows and Members of the Committee well know, that rape victims came to us and asked us to put this type of law into effect. Prosecutors came to us and asked us to put this into the law. Why did they ask us to do it? They asked us to do it because under the present law you're just not getting convictions for rape with a four year minimum in all cases. And the rape victims came to us and the prosecutors came to us and they said what good is it if it's four years or six years or eight years or twelve years if you're not getting convictions. And they felt that what we had to do is we had to divide it and put it into two different classifications and make it rape and aggravated rape, which was exactly the way ...which was exactly what we did. I would point out to you that aggravated rape is still...you know, a Class A felony



with a most severe penalty. Rape, by itself, when not aggravated becomes a Class II felony. I really think that the Governor, in writing this veto message, was misguided. I would certainly hope that this House would look at that veto message and realize that the Governor, I think, really went a little bit off the mark in this particular case and I would urge an 'aye' vote to override the Governor's Total Veto on House Bill 1185."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber on the motion."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Gentleman's argument was very clear but I believe that if you review the veto message you'll find what the Governor's position is and that is crystal clear and that is he doesn't feel, in this day and age, that we ought to reduce the minimum penalty for rape, which is in fact all this Bill does. There is a lot of verbiage by reclassifying rape into two kinds, aggravated and simple rape. The fact of the matter is that rape now, whether it be the type that the Sponsor chooses to call aggravated, is still rape and it's a Class I felony, as is any other type of rape which is forcible intercourse against the will of the woman. I don't feel that this General Assembly ought to be in a position to reduce the penalty for rape, no matter what the kind it be. Now the Sponsor indicates that the juries are reluctant to convict because of the penalty. Well, in a criminal proceeding the jury is not told what the proposed penalty would be in the event of a guilty verdict so I don't see where it would have any effect...material effect on the number of convictions brought about by a jury. Now I suggest that it would have effect on the number of plea bargains because indictments for aggravated rape would probably be reduced to simple rape in order to obtain a plea. If that's what you want to encourage then I would suggest that you vote to override, however, I feel that the Governor's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11/7/77

position is proper and I shall vote to sustain him."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson, on the motion."

Johnson: "Anybody who votes for this Bill had better be prepared to go back home to the various groups that are involved in rape counseling, to your State's Attorneys and to your police officers and tell them that what we did by House Bill 1185 was that we said to the people of Illinois, the rape penalty, the penalties for rape ought to be decreased. And further than that I think it's important to point out that if there's aggravating circumstances surrounding a rape, it can still be classified as a Class 1 felony as it is today and then those aggravating factors taken into consideration at the sentencing stage. But as Representative Leinenweber said, all that we're doing here by this particular Bill is to say that we're decreasing the penalties for rape and that a rapist in a number of circumstances can serve a one year minimum which means he is eligible for parole under our existing system in about nine months and turn him back loose on the streets to do it again. I, for one, don't want to vote in favor of that kind of proposition."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we can tell it's becoming around election time again.. Because I think that when we passed this Bill out in ...earlier this year and everybody was thinking reasonably and rationally and their minds were not clouded with ideas of getting reelected. Everyone thought that this was a good Bill, including, I might say some of the speakers that spoke beforehand. Let me tell you that if you don't vote for this Bill, what you're in essence doing is,....you're saying to rape victims who have testified before House Committees, that we really don't care if the person who perpetrates that particular crime gets convicted. You know, one of the Speakers said beforehand



that the prosecutors are against this particular Bill. You know that is completely and totally false. Every prosecutor that appeared before our Committee asked for two classifications of rape. Every rape victim that appeared before our Committee asked for two classifications of rape. I think just because you're going to make it six years or eight years or call it 'x', 'y' or 'b' or 'z', or whatever you're going to call it, the important thing that you want, I think, is to put away the rape victim. The only way that you are going to do it is by breaking it down into two different classifications as we did in this particular Bill and pass this Bill out over the Governor's veto. As I indicated to you beforehand, this passed both Houses of the General Assembly and it passed the House 146 to one, and it passed the Senate 44 to 6. I think it was a good Bill when we pass it, it's a good Bill now and it's a Bill that's needed in the State of Illinois and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1185 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take 107 votes. Representative Davis on the motion....or to explain his vote."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explanation of my vote, I rise in support of Representative Jaffe's Bill here. I think you all know my position on law and order. I believe this is a very good Bill simply because the statistics involved in rape prosecution are appalling. Hardly anyone is convicted. No one comes forward. No one bothers to prosecute the crime. The prosecutors are, indeed, in favor...in favor of this legislation. My State's Attorney is jumping up and down with joy waiting for me to call him and tell him this has been overridden. This will encourage prosecution of this crime and do not forget that a Class II felony carries a one to twenty rap and the judge...it's



in his hands then. At least you're going to get prosecutions and if the prosecutor has an aggravated or under our present law, a rape prosecution, he can prosecute under aggravated...and he'll get his conviction under aggravated, if not he might get a lesser included conviction under ordinary, if you will, or simple rape."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1185, in a lot of ways, is an extremely important Bill. I am not an attorney, nor have I served anywhere as a prosecutor so I cannot speak to you from that point of view. But I can speak to you from the point of view of a Legislator who for nearly three years and some months have sat on the Rape Study Committee and has listened to attorneys, prosecutors, victims, members of various organizations who have appeared before our Committee and told us some very trying kind of stories in regard to what has happened in the courts. This is the conclusion that we reached. We need two categories and two classes of rape. One to provide for a more serious penalty where you really have violence and harm. And another penalty for that rape situation which is not with violence, physical violence at any rate. The judges, the people will tell you who have been involved in juries will tell you in their discussions it is extremely difficult to convince people serving on that jury....to convince people serving on that jury that a woman, in fact, had not consented unless she does come physically beaten and bruised before that jury. That is a horrendous situation that we are in. The rules of evidence still protect defendants, the attorneys are there to protect the rights of the defendant, the judge is there to use his discretion, but this is one tool which this House agreed to accept by a vote of 146 to one and



the Senate accepted on a vote of 44 to 6. This is the same Bill Ladies and Gentlemen and I ask you seriously to consider giving approval to this Bill so that the prosecutors involved, the women and the jury would be able to have more discretion in terms of meeting this very serious and horrendous kind of problem. It would appear to me that many minds are already made up. We've got 93 votes, we need 14 more. I'm not going to speak any longer on this but ask you to consider again, very seriously, before this board is closed, those additional eleven votes. We need a vote that this House again accepted once before on a basis of 146 to one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stearney to explain his vote."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. I think this is the only Bill out of the Rape Study Commission that does merit the support of the House. Perhaps you may disagree as to the burden of proof on the prosecutor being smaller than it now is, but nevertheless the classification from rape and aggravated rape is good. One of the toughest judges in 26th Street has told me that there is 'rape' and there is 'rape'. By that I mean you have an individual going out with a girl, an 18 year old boy going out with a 17 year old girl for three months and now she accuses him of rape....and he is convicted of it. And you have the other situation where an individual drags a woman into an alley, beats her and rapes her. Now both of those defenses merit a Class I felony conviction, which means four years minimum in the penitentiary. The judge now is not going to be hesitant in imposing a four year term upon that individual who brutally beat a woman in an alley, but you take the situation now, where a boyfriend is accused ofand convicted by a jury, of raping his girlfriend. The judge is very much adverse to imposing a mandatory four year penitentiary sentence in that actual circumstance."



I think the Bill, however, attacks that problem because it...now it puts some discretion in the judges hands to handle those factual circumstances where you are not... a judge will not sentence a young man to the penitentiary where he is accused of a rape situation where it's a boyfriend-girlfriend. So I think this here Bill deserves our support. I think it's the only one that's come out that has great merit to it. I would ask that you kindly vote 'yes' on this one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, rape is a horrible crime, there's no ifs or buts about it and it's on the uprise. I don't always agree with the prior speaker, hardly ever, however, this is one time that I must agree with him because judges are awfully reticent about sentencing some moronic bum who commits rape, particularly when they are very young. I would like to say that this is not the most perfect Bill, but after we have had hearings of victims before us, many... many hearings, they were the ones that recommended, in order for people who are defendants in rape cases, who are the violators to be convicted we have to make it possible for judges to understand it a little better and it seems that they would understand it a little better by changing the penalties. One to ten years is quite a long time to spend in the penitentiary so I urge three more votes on the Board."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Johnson....explain your vote?"

Johnson: "No. I want to ask for a verification if this receives the appropriate number of votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian, for what reason do you arise?"

Mugalian: "I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."



Mugalian: "You know I seriously suggest that those who are voting 'no' are voting to protect rapists. It's really surprising to me how this Bill only had one negative vote when it came before us and now it has 45. You know a lot of study went into this and there really isn't any reason in the veto messagethere's nothing in it that's new. We're making a terrible mistake if we don't override his veto in this situation."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The motion having...on this Bill 123 'ayes', 41 'nays', and one voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 1185 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Who is...How is that? Do you persist in your verification? All right. Verify the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk....Poll the absentees first? Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Conti, Epton, Hudson, Klosak, Laurino, Matejek, McGrew, Schlickman, Tipsword, Winchester and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Bennett, Birchler, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Edgar, Ewell, Ewing, Flinn, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Grieman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Hoxsey,..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan, for what reason do you arise?"

Houlihan, J.: "Could I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified? Leave has been granted. Houlihan is verified, ...Jim."



Clerk O'Brien: "Hoxsey, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Keats, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lauer, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Lynn Martin, Peggy Smith Martin, Matijevich, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McLendon, McPike, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Walsh, W. or D...B., Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schnieder, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Van Duynes, Vitek Von Boeckman, Walsh, W. D. that is, Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge and Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Porter, for what reason do you arise?"

Porter: "I'd like to ask leave to be verified, please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. Porter has been verified. Representative Bradley, for what reason do you arise?"

Bradley: "Could I please be recorded as voting 'aye' on this Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "From 'present' to 'aye'? Representative Bradley from 'present' to 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Representative Johnson, do you have any question of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Johnson: "Antonovych....no, he's here. Never mind. Jane Barnes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Gene Barnes is in the middle aisle."

Johnson: "Jane Barnes...Jane Barnes."

Speaker Giorgi: "How is the Lady recorded, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mrs. Barnes in the chambers? Take her off the record."

Johnson: "Rich Brummer?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Jane Barnes is in the back of the room. Put Mrs. Barnes back on the record. Rich Brummer is in the back of the hall."

Johnson: "Don Brummet?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Don Brummet is in his seat."

Johnson: "Capparelli?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Capparelli is in the well here. Right there by the well."

Johnson: "Dawson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Say that again."

Johnson: "Dawson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dawson. Representative Dawson, how is he record, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Dawson in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Gaines?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gaines is in the middle aisle."

Johnson: "Garmisa?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Garmisa ison his seat."

Johnson: "Giglio?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Who was that again?"

Johnson: "Giglio?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He is in his seat."

Johnson: "Hanahan?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Hanahan is near the well here."

Johnson: "Harris?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Who did you say?"

Johnson: "Harris....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Harris. Representative Harris. Is Harris in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Harris. Is he in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Jacobs."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jacobs is in his seat."

Johnson: "Keats?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Keats is over here by Representative Mahar."

Johnson: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Giorgi: "Kornowicz is in his seat."

Johnson: "Lechowicz?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Lechowicz? Lechowicz is by the news chamber there."

Johnson: "Dan Houlihan?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Who was that?"

Johnson: "Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan? Representative Houlihan, how is he recorded, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "He is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Madigan?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan is standing behind me."

Johnson: "Mautino?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mautino is near the press booth there."

Johnson: "Mudd?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Right beside him."

Johnson: "Mulcahey?"

Speaker Giorgi: "In his seat."

Johnson: "O'Brien?"

Speaker Giorgi: "O'Brien is here."

Johnson: "Pouncey?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Pouncey is in his seat."

Johnson: "Schneider?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Schnieder? Representative Schneider? Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Sharp?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sharp is in his seat."



Johnson: "Von Boeckman?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Von Boeckman is in his seat."

Johnson: "Williams?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Williams? Representative Williams. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Williams, is he in the chambers? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "That's it."

Speaker Giorgi: "That's it. What does that leave, Mr. Clerk?"

On this question there are 119 affirmative...affirmed voters, 41 voting 'no', one voting 'present', the motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority prevails and House Bill 1185 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's veto...with the necessary three-fifths majority. House Bill...On Total Veto Motions, House Bill 1524, Representative Walsh. Out of the record. Representative Breslin on House Bill 1975.. Representative Breslin on House Bill 1975..."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that House Bill 1975 'do pass', the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen House Bill 1975 deals with the correction of the Criminal Code, specifically 1402(b). At the present time those drugs which fall under 1402(b) are not scheduled. I have redrafted this legislation because 1402(b) now requires the penalties for the use of certain specific drugs to be greater than the penalties for the sale or the manufacture of those same drugs. I feel that this present law is unconstitutional and it is also inconsistent with the present legislative intent for sentencing of drug users. At the present time...Section 1100 indicates that is the intent of the General Assembly to penalize most heavily the illicit traffickers or profiteers of controlled substances who propagate and perpetuate the abuse of such substances with reckless



disregard for its consumptive consequences upon every element of society. Further, we have stated that it is not the intent of the General Assembly to treat the unlawful user or occasional petty distributor of controlled substances with the same severity as the large scale unlawful purveyors and traffickers of controlled substances. We are not talking here about purveyors or traffickers. We are here talking about the users of small amounts of the less harmful scheduled substances. At the present time the Statute requires a greater penalty than that for some of the manufacturers or the sellers. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Leinenweber: "I'm looking at that Staff Analysis of a veto message in the Bill and it would indicate that the Bill, in effect, separates out offenses for the sale of drugs which are narcotic and continues them at the current Class III felony penalty and then makes a new Class IV for sale of those scheduled drugs which are quote, not narcotic. Is that correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "Put Breslin back on."

Breslin: "Not sales but for users."

Leinenweber: "For users?"

Breslin: "Yes. This is 1402 (b) not 1401."

Leinenweber: "All right, but it does ...for users then it does distinguish between whether a drug on schedules I and II are narcotic and those which are not narcotic?"

Breslin: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "The Governor indicates and I'd ask you whether or not this is true, that this would require the states to prove an additional element in order to prove a Class III felony, which is to prove that the drug is narcotic



and this would raise a wide variety of technical arguments over addictiveness of a drug. Is that true?"

Breslin: "No, that is not a fair statement, Representative.

For one thing, our present Statutes defines what a narcotic drug is. It is the prosecutors responsibility to prove that the drugthat a specific drug was used and he has to prove what drug it is. As soon...and he would have to do that whether it was the sales, manufacturer or the use of whatever drug it was. Once he has proved that then it falls into the classification of what is a narcotic drug ...or it is not a narcotic drug and that would happen automatically."

Leinenweber: "Well, as I understand it, now you have to....as you point out, the prosecutor has to prove that a specific drug was in fact used or sold or whatever, and then under current law, he merely finds out what ...where it's scheduled and that's the ..."

Breslin: "Correct."

Leinenweber: "...necessary proof. Now you would have to go beyond, it would seem to me, and prove that the particular drug is of narcotic or addictive quality. That seems to me to be an additional burden. It would make more sense, it would seem to me, to go back over all of the schedules and ferret out those which are not narcotic and then so that it can be done statutorily...so all the prosecutor has to do would be to prove a specific drug. Wouldn't that make more sense?"

Breslin: "Representative, in my opinion that's what happens under this law. Under this Bill as it is presently drafted; and I fail to understand the Governor's objection."

Leinenweber: "Well, as I understand, his objection is that the Bill itself doesn't specify which drugs are narcotic and which ones are not. That would be an item of proof."

Breslin: "What I'm saying Representative, is that that is



incorrect. It would not be an item of proof any more than is presently required. It is presently in the law what is narcotic and what is not narcotic."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion the question is, shall House Bill 1975 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Breslin. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote I'm really addressing myself to the people up there that are voting 'present'... or excuse me, not voting at all. There are ...at the present time 52 Members of the House who are not voting, most of them are, I think, in the chamber, and I think if the issue is considered on merit, it is, on the face of it ridiculous that the ...the use of certain controlled substances would receive stiffer penalties than manufacture, sale or distribution of the same substances. I think, on the face of it is a very worthy measure. I think, frankly, let's confront the issue head on, people are not voting because of the questions that have been quoted in the past about Representative Breslin's status here and so forth and I think that is really beside the point. I am rising to speak as one person who voted to accept the Minority Report although I did so with deep regret, but on the issue here, the issue is not Peg Breslin, the issue is the Controlled Substances Act and I think we ought to get on the stick and vote our switches and not lay back."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Mrs. Breslin."

Breslin: "I'd like to take this Bill out of the record, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Under the rules, Mrs. Breslin, you'll be unable to take it out of the record. Would you like to place it on Postponed Consideration? If you desire Postponed Consideration, Mr. Walsh informs me that you



need 70 votes, so if one more person would vote for your motion...Postponed Consideration.....This matter shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. On the Order of Total Veto Motions there appears House Bill 1218, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that House Bill 1218 'do pass', the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1218 is one of a series of three Bills that we passed this year that would provide for annual state grants and funding of up to 25 percent for the construction of libraries throughout the statepublic libraries. This was a Bill....and 1218 was a joint product of the Democrats in the House Joint Study Committee, the Revenue Subcommittee, the ...in 1974 we held hearing throughout the state. One of the main things we found was a need for library and library construction. The program, I might say, had the support of the Secretary of State, Mike Howlett, it has the support of the Secretary of State Alan Dixon. This Bill contains no funds. The Governor, in his Amendatory Veto said something to the effect that he favored help with libraries but he didn't want to open up funding for them and he didn't want to open up the authorization for capital expenditures for libraries. This Bill does not contain any money, 1218 is a Bill that would authorize, at some future date, if we don't do it this year, some funds for construction of libraries. 1219 and 1220 were the Bills that had the construction money in them. This would be on an annual basis. It'd have to be controlled by the General Assembly and voted by the Secretary of State. It passed the House originally by a three-fifths vote and the Senate only had two 'no' votes ...in the Senate. This is a library Bill and one that I think that we should put on



the books now and then when the funding is available, whether it's this year or some other year, we would have the mechanics to help with construction grants and the building of libraries throughout the state. I'd urge that we override the Governor's veto on House Bill 1218. Representative Gene Barnes is the Cosponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to just echo Representative Dunn in his explanation of House Bill 1218. This Bill, in itself, as Representative Dunn has indicated, has no funding in itself. What it does is establish that the General Assembly andin their wisdom has agreed that our library systemto be perpetuated need this kind of assistance to insure that all of our constituents will have the kind of library facilities that we all need and that we all use. In House Bill 1218, what we're asking here is to establish that fact into law and when additional funding comes down, whether it's this General Assembly or the next one or the one beyond that, they can then act on the merits of that funding in response to this program. That, hopefully, we can set up here. No one and even in the Governor's veto message, does he indicate that there is not a need for this kind of legislation. As a matter of fact, notwithstanding, he sights that fact that he believes that this kind of ...strong public library system is of a necessity. So what we're asking here is that we agree as we did last spring in both the House and the Senate, when we passed these Bills overwhelmingly, to pass this Bill to set out the merits of the program that we hope that we will like to see all of the library systems be beneficiary of. I would solicit your support in support of Representative Dunn and myself as Cosponsor, to overriding the Governor's veto in this instance and in support of House Bill 1218."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I also rise in support of this veto override. I'm tempted to try and make a comparison between some of the flaky things that have been stuck in the Capital Development Board budget since I've been in the General Assembly and this proposal of one million dollars per year, which of course would not start this year because we haven't appropriated the money, but I will forgo that temptation and merely argue that this may be the only Bill that you will ever see me stand up in favor of that has a tinge of regional government in it. If that doesn't perk anybody's ears up I'd be greatly surprised. Perhaps I can send you a fetcher by suggesting that it is something that will benefit Chicago and I think legitimately so because the Chicago Public Library is a library for all of the state. It is used as a reference source by those who are serious about research. For that reason, it seems to me that the ...that the special grant included in the first two or three years of the proposal, whereby, 50 percent of that or \$500,000 a year may go to subsidize the new Chicago Public Library is justified. Beyond that I would suggest...or I would remind you that the state library system has been administering such a program for several years and this would merely restore a past program. It's a way that local libraries can get built with state assistance at the discretion of the Governor and the Executive Branch. When one reflects upon the type of recreational activities that one's constituents are likely to take a look at during recessionary periods, I suggest libraries come at the top of the list. They are free."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I rise in support of House Bill 1218. As you know this Bill was Cosponsored by Representative Ralph Dunn,



and Gene Barnes. I support the Bill because the availability of reference sources and the general services provided by a public library are sadly lacking in many Illinois communities. And in times of inflation and tight budgets most cities have difficulty funding the construction of new library facilities. Many libraries, particularly in your small communities, are aging decrepit structures that don't have the size and the volume to be of real value to a community. If the state should play any roll in the lives of its people it should provide public access to literature and information through a public library system. As has been indicated in previous remarks, the Chicago Public Library is the outstanding library in the State of Illinois. And certainly this Bill will go a long way to continuing that tremendous reference center and research center that the state and many others in Illinois have used for so many years. So..I would hope that you would vote to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 1218."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Mr. Dunn to close the debate."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the other three speakers have made an adequate case; I hope they have, for the overriding of House Bill 1218. As I have mentioned and they have each mentioned, there's no money in this Bill. This is merely ...or not merely it is an outstanding Bill.. It is an authorization so that some day we can fund it. I shouldn't say it's a merely Bill because certainly public libraries can't be called merely. They are one of the greatest assets in a community. And by passing this Bill so that when we do have the money whether it's in this General Assembly or some future one, that we can authorize some Capital Development Bond funds for construction grants up to 25 percent of the cost of the libraries. I'd urge an 'aye' vote on the override of the Governor's



Veto of House Bill 1218. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 1218 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Beatty to explain his vote."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my 'aye' vote, if it hasn't been stated previously, a Bill of this nature arose out of some statewide hearings that were held on a ...through the subcommittee of the Revenue Committee a number of years ago and we held hearings in Carbondale, in Kankakee, Chicago, Rockford and a number of other places and we had librarians then to testify as to their needs throughout the state. At that time it was indicated that, among other things, the Chicago Library was providing services to various segments of the State of Illinois and so that that is not just a local library but it serves the entire state. Now these...this Bill provides for grants to the libraries throughout the State of Illinois. Many times these local people do not have the necessary resources, although, some requirements were set down that they should make efforts to pass local bonding Bills before they could benefit from a grant. But the idea here is very good. If you can't support libraries I'd like to know what you can support. I ask for a green vote on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gene Hoffman to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would only suggest to you that there is a companion Bill to this 1219, which calls for the floating of 2 million dollars worth of bonds. Now this is a new program and if you feel sufficiently secure that our Capital Development Funds are sufficient and that you believe that we should go deeper into debt, then you should support this Bill. I for one don't believe that we can afford this. For example, next year we are going



to have to come around and look at the question again at what we're going to do with school bond construction money because the four year period on that runs out, particularly on the deferment of interest costs. So I think the question of priorities and I think that we have to look at the fiscal condition of the state. This is in fact a new program. In one of the communities in my district, they are building a brand-new library because the people in that community felt that it was important enough to pass a bond issue and pay for it themselves."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewing to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the last speaker hit it very well on the head when he talked about a new program. I'd also like to point out that we do this and we say it's not going to cost any money now. But the same people who are up telling us this will be up on the next Bill or next Session telling us how we committed ourselves to do this when we passed this Bill. It's those future commitments that are killing us financially. I'm not opposed to building new libraries and helping. Let's wait until we have the funds available. Let's don't be the fastest growing state in the Union as far as bonded indebtedness. I would ask for some more 'no' votes on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House one of the...the two last Gentlemen who spoke to this Bill indicated to you that there was a matter of some 2 million dollars involved in this legislation, or that there would be a companion Bill coming along with that amount of money in it. I would suggest that you look at the Calendar and you'll see that there's no veto motion filed on appropriation Bills 1219 and 1220. There are no override requested on those two pieces of legislation. We're talking about House Bill 1218 and not



1219 and not 1220. There are no funds requested and no motions filed to override those two appropriation Bills." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hart to explain his vote."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we could view the list of appropriations authorized for the Capital Development Board to spend bond money on, we would see how ludicrous it is to consider the library shouldn't be on that list. As Representative Yourell said, the motion to fund the 2 million dollar program is not being pushed by the Sponsor. All this request here is ..is to say that libraries in the State of Illinois are among those which the Capital Development Bond can be spent for in the future. We will not be able to spend any of those bonds for libraries without an Act of the legislature in subsequent Sessions of the General Assembly. But I believe that it....it's overdue for us to at least go along with this Bill to authorize the program of future spending in assistance to local library systems for development of capital facilities."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise in support of this Bill too. Not only is there no money authorized in this Bill, there also has to be local initiative once we do authorize the money. In other words that the local library will have to pass a referendum and come up with 75 percent of the money. I think we owe the local people the help. Prices have gone up and they could certainly use this. If they have the initiative to start a library, where all the citizens of the community can use it why then I think we should put in at least 25 percent to help them. I think it should have been higher than 25 percent, but 25 percent is a good start."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn to explain his vote."



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just reiterate what several others have said. There isn't any money in this Bill. People talk about how much money we're spending on libraries. This is a Bill that will authorize, at some future date, as Representative Hart said, that libraries can be counted among those institutions eligible for Capital Development funds. I think that if you have a local library you're fortunate and I'll bet you that it needs money, it needs construction. Most of them do, but it only gives 25percent. It means that 75 percent would have to come from local areas and none of it would come without authorization from this General Assembly. I certainly would urge that you give it enough votes to get this Bill passed and then we can try, next year or the year after, someone said, certainly some day they'll be back here for library funds....and I think they should be counted among those different institutions that can have some funding when it's available. But this Bill is not a money Bill. I would urge that you give it an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...the Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has 103 votes. I'd urge that it be put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have it placed on Postponed Consideration? Hearing no objection, it will be placed on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2126. The Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2126 is the appropriation measure for House Bill 2173. House Bill 2173....There is also an override motion filed. Representative John Lauer is principal Sponsor of House Bill 2173 and if procedurally correct we would ask both House Bill 2126 and House Bill 2173 be considered together."



Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider both Bills together? Hearing no objection, 2126 and 2173 will be heard together."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you and at this time I would like to defer to Representative Lauer."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer.....The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber. Pardon me, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we discussed the merits of House Bill 2173, the Probation Subsidies Bill at considerable length on several occasions, in the House. I think we are all agreed that the area of prevention of recidivism is probably the most important single aspect of the whole crime prevention package. We come to this Session of the General Assembly We're called into a Special Session which has to do with corrections, with law and justice...law enforcement and justice. It seems to me that we're missing the boat, Mr. Speaker, if we do not take some approach that not only will work on the preventive aspects, but especially in the case of these offenders who have been convicted one time and are now granted either probation or granted parole under the probation services of the court. If we do not have these people handled by the very highest caliber people, then we can anticipate that the rate of return to the Department of Corrections is going to be unusually high. Mr. Speaker, we know that this is not a perfect Bill, we know that this is not the final approach that we will want to take, but at the present time we cannot afford to spend the 20 or 21 million dollars that it would probably cost to set up what was embodied in the Catania Bill or in Representative Getty's Bill. But Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we must get started. We can no longer afford to wait any longer. We have to start upgrading the standards in



probation services, we have to give these people a professional status, we have to be able to require certain minimum standards of training so that we can actually have the probation services people do the job which they are supposed to do and which the people of this state so desperately need. Mr. Speaker, I submit that even though the cost of this Bill, 2126 and 2173 is approximately 2.1 million dollars, that we simply cannot afford to wait another year to draft another Bill and to go through the machinations of trying to scare up the money. Back in June the Governor said that he could find the money to finance the Bill. It was on that basis that Representative Houlihan and I passed the Bill. Now, because of a disagreement with some of the language in the Bill, the Governor has, instead of amendatorily vetoing it, which I recommended, has totally vetoed the Bill. I do not think that we can afford to waste the time to go back and start the whole process again. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate very much an 'aye' vote on the motion to override the Governor's veto and let's get started on the job.... For technical questions on the Bill I'd refer you to Representative Houlihan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I join with Representative Lauer in this motion to override the Governor's veto of both of these Bills. By way of background as I'm sure most here in the chamber are familiar with, for the past several years we've attempted to enact legislation that would provide a state subsidy for county probation officers. Over the four or five year period that we have considered those Bills we have been unable to pass any legislation which addresses the question meaningfully, which has passed both houses. Now for the first time in this Session we



have adopted, on a bipartisan basis, a Bill which does address in a substantial form, the pressing needs of county probation officers across this state. Essentially what the Bill does by way of funding is to provide an increase in the present juvenile probation officer subsidy from \$300 a month to \$500 a month and to make an equivalent probation....an equivalent state subsidy to county probation officers now, for the first time, for adult probation officers. The Governor's veto message here did not refer to the amount of the funding. This was the least expensive of all of the probation measures that were considered here by the House and by the Senate. It has an appropriation of 2.2 million dollars. In fact the Governor's budget director has committed that this money was available for this type of legislation. Committed that not only to the House Judiciary II Committee but also to the Senate Judiciary Committee. The objection of the Governor was to the effect that certain authority was removed from the administrative office of the Illinois courts for the purpose of setting minimum hiring and promotional standards, a system of training for probation officers, a uniform record keeping system and a uniform system of collecting statistical data on probation services which are being rendered by the individual county units. What apparently the Governor's message totally overlooked is the fact that there already is a program in existence for juvenile probation officers that provides that this same authority, as far as record keeping standards et cetera, will be done by the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges of the state. And that is the statewide standard presently for juvenile probation officers. Now with this Bill, which essentially increases the amount of that subsidy, but then expands the subsidy also for adult probation officers, the compromise measure that was agreed to by both Houses of this Legislature, was to keep



that authority in the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges. Now that is what Representative Lauer is referring to, if this was his problem he should have done it on an Amendatory Veto. However, there is a state-wide standard in this Bill and the Governor's Message seems to overlook it in its entirety. It's the same standard that has been in existence now for several years for juvenile probation officers. One of the things that this Legislature is going to have to occupy itself with in this Special Session is on this Class X program of criminal justice. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, under any form of the Class X program that has been mentioned here on this House floor there will be a tremendous increase and burden put on county probation officers just for presentence investigation reports. In the County of Cook it is estimated that it will cost at least three quarters of a million dollars additional funding for the county probation system. Now these two Bills passed this House and the Senate by a substantial margin. It provides needed funding for every county in this state. I urge your support of what is an absolutely essential measure if we are to improve the quality of probational services in this state. I'd be happy to answer whatever questions you might have respecting the merits of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions for the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he'll...which Sponsor, Mr. Lauer or Houlihan?"

Leinenweber: "I understand Mr. Houlihan is the one that's going to make the ...answer the questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan indicates that he will yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Houlihan, what kind of staff does the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges currently have?"



Houlihan, D.: "I'm not quite sure, Representative Leinenweber, what is the present staff that the Conference has, of course each of the Chief Circuit Judges, particularly in the larger counties, do have a number of staff. I know that's particularly true in the county that I come from, Cook. That staff was increased by legislation passed in this past year. The same was true for DuPage County, as far as the number of staff which are available to the Chief Circuit Court Judges office in each of those counties. So I can't answer your question, totally, as to how much of that is related specifically to the Conference of these judges themselves."

Leinenweber: "It is my understanding that minimum hiring and promotional standards ...that the Bill, as you originally had it introduced, were deleted by the Senate, and now the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges is given carte blanche to establish the appropriate standards for future employees of the probation offices. Is that correct?"

Houlihan, D.: "The standards that will be in effect as a result of this legislation will be the same standards that we are operating under, under present law, for the existing subsidy, up to a maximum of \$300 per month, for juvenile probation officers. So in expanding that program we are using them, in effect, the same standards. The word 'carte blanche' of course is a connotative word. I'm not quite sure just what you mean by it. But the fact is that they will be the group that will set the standards and those standards will be, as far as a minimum, applicable throughout the state."

Leinenweber: "All right, now, to monitor for compliance I understand that as you originally introduced the Bill the chief administrative office of the Illinois courts was to do the monitoring and that has been transferred to the Comptroller. Is that correct?"

Houlihan, D.: "What you are referring to there is on the fiscal



reporting.....considerations....and it was felt that that could be more closely monitored by the Comptroller. What we are attempting to get at here, as far as establishing the hiring and promotional standards is that that should be done by the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges. Essentially that reference in the legislation is a technical one. It was felt that that type of fiscal record keeping could be done more properly by the state's chief fiscal officer, the Comptroller."

Leinenweber: "Well then there is no one from the state....representating the state, to insure that the state subsidy money is being well spent, other than the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges."

Houlihan, D.: "No, that is not correct, Representative Leinenweber. What this Bill provides that there must, in effect, be a match in order to be eligible for the subsidy that there has to be a match from the individual counties who are seeking this subsidy from the state. The way that match is framed, it must require the payment of a minimum salary for the subsidized probation officers of \$11,000 per year."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might briefly address the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "House Bill 2173, when it was heard in House Committee in which it was originally introduced, I believe was a Bill that, not only we, but the Governor could have supported. Unfortunately, when the Bill got to the Senate, some forces went to work on it and reduced this Bill to what probably could be adequately described as the patronage subsidy Bill of 1977. Where previously there had been a state office, to wit, the administrative office of the court, to establish minimum standards and certain minimum standards placed in the Bill that were immutable. These are all gone. This has been replaced by the so-called



Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges, which is an agency currently existing, but certainly in the opinion of many, does not have adequate staff nor resources to handle the job given to it by this Bill. In addition, the Bill completely grandfathers all existing probation officers no matter what their qualifications have been. There is no requirement in this Bill that the county who keeps these people on their payroll...that these people establish any future or meet any future educational or other types of criteria. Finally, instead of having the Illinois Office of the Court, Judge Gulley's offices, monitor the state...er...the local programs to see whether or not they comply with the standards established by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges, of which the state itself has no control, this has been switched to the Comptroller, of all people. I ask you to consider what possible criteria the Comptroller, and how he is equipped to handle this particular job. I think, unfortunately, and I certainly have supported several of the programs which were introduced last spring, because I happen to believe that upgrading our probation system is probably the single most important step that we can take in our war against crime. I suggest to you that throwing money at it and that's all this Bill now does, throws the sum of \$2,200,000 at this particular problem, is not going to solve it. I think that we are going to perpetuate the existing system which everybody agrees is not working properly. And I think if we are ever going to turn the state tax purse over to local governments, to run the probation systems, that we ought to insist that they are done on a nonpartisan and an appropriate, highly skilled way. I do not think that House Bill 2126 is the proper route to take and I would suggest that the Governor's absolutely right in his veto message and I would certainly solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Telcser."



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Sponsors of this Bill indicated that it would be some two and a half million dollars of cost to the state regarding this particular program. Let me remind the Members of the House that would be the cost for about one half of a fiscal year. And that the annual cost of this program would very shortly begin to cost us some five to six million dollars a year, money which has not been appropriated or designed for the current fiscal year in a state budget. Let me also point out to you, as did the prior speaker, that there are no standards set for the probation officers who we would be reimbursing some half time, regarding this Bill. These standards, as I understand it, would be set up by the local circuit judges. I don't think it's a responsible function for us and for this Assembly to be appropriating this kind of money and not setting some standards of professional conduct as to how or where that money is going to be spent. Many of us are familiar with the local circuits in our area. I know what the local circuit court could possibly do in the City of Chicago, or the County of Cook, with this huge number of dollars and the ability to hire people with those dollars. They may be called probation officers, but I don't know what they are going to do, I don't know what their standards are going to be and I think that as a Member of the General Assembly, I ought to know that. The salaries are at a very high level...and yet there are still no standards. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there seems to be a lethargy among this Assembly for the last couple of days. We've been very willy-nilly overriding veto messages, we've been voting with listening to Bills with half an ear and as a result there's kind of a pall that hangs over us. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's about time we started to pay closer attention to what we've been doing. I think the



possible abuses which could take place under this House Bill are reason enough for us to sustain the Governor's Veto Message. This legislation could be used for pure political purposes. I don't believe that the way this Bill has been written could possible add to the reform of the probation system in our state. I, along with many Members of the House, have worked for many years to reform the probation system. I agree we need a statewide system and a professional one. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2126 and its companion Bill do not fit the bill. They do not answer our problems of a uniform statewide probation system. The Governor's veto ought to be upheld. These Bills are pure politics."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion, who wishes to close the debate? Mr. Houlihan?"

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I agree with Representative Telcser that we should pay closer attention to the Bills. I suggest that he might start an example by his own paying closer attention to the Bills. He would not get up and make statements which are founded, frankly, on ignorance. Now the fact is that they are not highly paid when they are professionals at \$11,000 a year. The fact is that it is not a boondoggle and the fact is that this Bill should not be subject just to a political attack by the Republican leader simply because now he's getting scared that this Legislature is looking at these vetoes seriously and is fulfilling their legislative function. When we stand and we override an ill-founded veto. That's what this is, a very ill-founded veto. We're talking about, with this Governor, the strongest, loudest, most vocal law and order man that this state has seen in years, but on a two point two million dollar appropriation for probation officers in this state and they admit that the probation system is in serious jeopardy, they give us a



political tirade and they won't address this realistically, or honestly. Now the fact is that the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges is now the present statewide standard for juvenile probation officers. Now it's there, it's been there since 1966 and as a result of it 90 percent of the juvenile probation officers in this state now hold bachelor's degrees at a minimum. It has professionalized the system. We must now expand it. We've got to bring it in for the adult probation system. Now we are not talking about a great deal of money. The amount of money that we are talking about was committed by this Governor. And committed by his budget director. Now you know what's in the Bill. Five years in a row this Legislature has failed to move and to enact meaningful legislation in this area. The need is fundamental.....and it is a very real crisis that we are facing. Think about it. This time we passed a bipartisan Bill and Representative Lauer and I are standing here jointly on this motion to override the Governor. We ask for your support. I think it is the most important Bill of this entire Session."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2126 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor...and 2173? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Membership should understand that we are now voting on two Bills; House Bill 2126 and also House Bill 2173. Mr. Getty to explain his vote."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. While I was the Sponsor of a Bill that would have created a statewide probation system and I still believe that that is ultimately the thing that we should do, the best possible way to go, a comprehensive statewide system. This Bill is absolutely necessary now if we're going to deal with the problems of crime. The rising problems of crime. If we're going to deal intelligently with our criminal justice system, to upgrade it, we must have



the backup and that means we have to immediately improve our probation system. This is very definitely a needed step in the right direction and I hope that you would vote to override."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Satterthwaite to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier today we have acted on Bills that will provide additional money for building state correctional facilities. Earlier today we have also acted to upgrade the salaries of people who were making 20 or 25 thousand dollars on the justification that they were not receiving enough to get qualified people into those positions. Here we are now asking for a few more votes to support a Bill that will allow us to upgrade the salaries from some counties that are now paying 7 thousand dollars for a full time physician for a probation officer. Certainly if there are people who cannot make a contribution to society to be employed at 25 thousand dollars, we cannot expect to get high quality people into service in this position at a salary like 7 thousand dollars a year. We have our choice of having a decent probation system where we can give the kind of supervision that may channel someone into a better way of life and not have them end up being subsidized much more heavily in our correction system. I would urge you to add your vote to support this override. It's a very worthwhile investment of a relatively small amount of state money."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill was indeed a reasonable approach when it first went through this House but in the Senate the Democrat organization from Cook County got its hands on it and what it now is, is over one million dollars a year as a subsidy to Cook County, to pay its patronage workers to go out and campaign against Republicans in the elections.



I think the Governor full well knew what he was doing when he vetoed it. It's not true that this is our last chance to solve this aspect of the criminal justice problems. You may recall that one of the things we're doing here this week is working in a criminal justice Special Session. We have a perfect opportunity in our Special Session to address the problem of probation rationally, do not be stampeded by the impassioned pleas of the people from Cook County who were here a little while ago working this side of the aisle because they so desperately want their over a million dollars a year to subsidize their patronage army. They said that we have been trying for five years to do something about the probation system. That's because the Democrat organization from Cook County wouldn't let the Unified Code of Corrections pass with the state-wide uniform probations system that it had. It had to be removed if the unified code was to go into effect. So they can take all of the credit for ^{our} not having unified statewide probation. You also heard that the counties have to put up a match if they want to get part of this subsidy. Ask yourselves how many counties have enough money to put up the matching funds. Right now we have 70 separate probation systems here in Illinois that would do nothing to correct that disparity....nor would it help the little counties that can't now afford to pay probation officers. This is a giant rip-off for Cook County. I'm from Cook County but I think too much of the district I represent to do this to my constituents. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I sat in this Assembly and listened to the Governor call for a partnership. I suggest that not the entire repository of brains and intelligence lies on the second floor. That we, in this Body might have a small bit of those brains and



intelligence. Now we have surveyed the possibilities of what we can do for the probation system and I think that this is a reasonablea reasonable and an intelligent solution to a most difficult problem. It is not our fault that for some reason the evil hatchets of retrogression have struck at some progressive legislation. I suggest to you that we that we are willing to spend millions of dollars for correctional facilities to house a very few people. Why not a few dollars for the probation system that has the day to day care and custody of thousands upon thousands of people and that is really and truly the arm of law enforcement that is most needed. I suggest that this Body is entitled to send to the people something more than a label. Something more than a class X, if you will, and say to the world, look what we have done for you. We have now put in a label, call it class X, and the war against crime is won. Send us back to office and we'll give you another label, 'Y' for next year and the year after that we'll give you 'Z'. I suggest we might adopt three other initials and the first one could begin with an 'A'. We won't have to go into the other two. But I suggest that this Bill is a reasonable and an intelligent approach to the problem and we beseech the people from the other side of the aisle and those of you from downstate to aid us in our plight once in a while. We have problems in Cook County, but this Bill addresses the entire state and will be most beneficial to the other smaller counties. I would urge, just the fact that you consider the Bill on its merits and toss away bipartisan consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Stiehl to explain her vote."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All of us are cognizant of the problems of our existing probation system. And all of us are troubled with the problem of recidivism, but Ladies and Gentlemen of this



House, to provide a subsidy without providing any method of reform in the system is wrong. To pass a Bill that doesn't even require minimum hiring and promotional standards nor any system of training for our probation officers would be wrong. Let's defeat this motion...and let's pass a Bill that will truly reform our probation system at another time. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Darrow to explain his vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there's a great deal of confusion over this legislation. The last speaker mentioned the lack of standards. I felt that Representative Houlihan had adequately answered this. We have had standards, they've been used, they've applied throughout the State of Illinois. They are good standards. As was indicated, with this legislation and similar legislation we will be upgrading our probation officers. I recall about four or five years ago in Rock Island County, in order to be a probation officer all you had to do was know someone on the County Board. They were hiring mainly retirees. Today through the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and a federal grant we were able to upgrade those standards. We no longer have the retirees. We have people who are trained in probation and social services and social work and things of that nature doing a meaningful job. They are using the standards we now have. When I look at that board and I see that my colleagues from Western Illinois are not voting or don't know how to vote on this issue I'm a little surprised. I've received letters from Rock Island County, Whiteside County and Henry County which is represented by nine Representatives in this House, yet last time when I check on that board a number of them were not voting. All I can say is the probation department in my area of the state are for this, it will help them, it will financially help the counties. It's not a Chicago



Bill. This is a Bill for the State of Illinois. I feel that the downstaters from Southern Illinois, Western Illinois, Central Illinois....should be on this Roll Call voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Lauer to explain his vote."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Darrow touched upon a point that I think is very well taken, that is the fact that many of the County Boards have already built into their next year's budget...the money that they were anticipating receiving from this Bill because we did pass the Bill. The Governor has said he would sign 2173. They are acting in good faith because they anticipate increasing the salaries of their probation officers and they are also anticipating an increase in standards and an increase in level of performance. If we do not override this veto, Ladies and Gentlemen, we will once again, as simply said to local units of government in the state, don't pay any attention to what they say they are going to do in Springfield because somehow or other even though they give their word they will weasel out of it. This is a case of....you are breaking faith with the people back home and you are breaking faith also with the people that can least afford to have it broken. There is the situation Mr. Speaker, that some of these young people that are subject to probation service are subject to that service only because society has broken faith with them so many times before. I am not standing here to say mea magna culpa or to beat our collective breasts and say it's our fault. Certainly there was at least a contributory negligence. But by the same token I think that rather than attempt to punish further and further and further, we need to hold out a hand of help to show the proper path. To help them to get a job and to hold that job."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take



the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 54 'nos', 5 voting 'present', and this matter shall be....and this matter shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mr. Walsh, do you wish to call your Bill today? Shall we take this out of the record for the remainder of the day? Mr. Tipsword, House Bill 2164?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that House Bill 2164 'do pass', the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Bill that we started to take up the other day when a lot of the Members were off the floor of the House. This is the Bill relating to the composition of the State Mining Board. This Bill was amended, to provide in the Senate, that the employee members of the State Mining Board, there being three in number, to be representative of the employee miner throughout the State of Illinois; should be persons who represent at least 15 percent of the coal miners in this state, should come from a miner's organization that represents at least 15 percent of the coal miners in this state. Presently there is a member of that State Mining Board who comes from an organization representing 3.3 percent of the total miners in the State of Illinois. Now we....some would say and the Governor has said in his veto message, which is a total veto message, that this is unrepresentative and consequently is unacceptable because it would provide that some people belong to an organization representing only 3.3 percent of the employed miners in the State of Illinois, would be to disenfranchise those persons. Well, I would suggest to you that there are some 33 different provisions for boards and agencies in the State of Illinois that do exactly that....setting forth specifications as to who should be the representative members on the various boards and agencies and commissions in this state. This merely and simply provides that whoever serves upon them represent employees or an organization that represents



employees in the State of Illinois before they serve upon that State Mining Board; so that the voice of the employed miners of this state would really be heard by those people who are appointed to represent them upon this board. There are also three members of the employing groups, the companies, upon this board and they are well and totally and fully represented. All that this Bill would do, it would simply provide that the miners themselves have full representation upon this board so that their...they can be heard fully upon safety matters as they come up in the various mines throughout this state. This is not unconstitutional because it has been reviewed time after time by both the federal courts and by the state courts, in making this kind of representation requirements. Here and in the Federal Government and in other states and it has not been held to be unconstitutional but in fact it has said that the Legislature has the perfect right to set up these qualifications and qualifications of this kind. I would call upon you to override the Governor. This is not the only matter that is in this Bill. There are some very important changes that are necessary to make the board effective otherwise in the State Mining Safety Code. So I call upon you to override the veto of the Governor upon this House Bill 2164."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I said the other day when this Bill was called and then taken out of the record, I don't believe that it should be the policy of the State of Illinois to say that any representation on a board of this kind or any other kind of board in Illinois, that you should have to represent at least 15 percent of any group. It's a terrible suppression of minority representation. I believe it's contrary to what state policy should be....it isn't a matter of whether it's Constitutional or not it's just a



question of whether it's good policy of the State of Illinois. This was a good Bill when the Gentleman started out with it, but this provision in here which was thrown in to try to exclude one union representing certain coal miners over another is a matter that the Legislature should stay out of. So I think in view of the fact that this bad provision was placed in this Bill that the Governor's veto should be sustained and the Legislature should not go along with the suppression of minority representation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body, I would rise in support of Representative Tipsword's motion. Coming from a district with a number of coal miners and knowing, in that particular district, that there is no one who represents the particular organization that statewide has only three percent or less of the membership of the coal miners throughout Illinois. As Representative Tipsword indicated, this is not a precedent setting measure. In fact, in the Teacher's Certification Board as I pointed out the other day, it's necessary to have, not 15 percent, but indeed 20,000 actual members before a group can even put up a nominee for that board's membership. This runs in line with that. In fact and indeed as I understand it, the particular organization representing only three percent of the miners in this state, which has a seat on the board, a small board, indeed does not hold or share the same viewpoint as the organization that we all know is representative of the great bulk of the miners in this state. It is not undemocratic in that sense. It is a Bill...a Bill that is necessary to give a voice to the miners...the overwhelming percentage of the miners represented in this state by one organization. It is not precedent setting as I said. It is a Bill that also has some important factors involved with safety that this General Assembly has long taken steps



to provide. It is a Bill that ought to be passed. The veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. I urge an 'aye' vote for those reasons."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this Gentleman's motion. And although I'm not intimately familiar with the problems of mining or the intertwining relationships among the various unions who now represent the miners or who may seek to represent them at some future date. I do want to say that it seems quite unfair to me to set some arbitrary figure as to how many miners or people an individual or group should represent in order to be appointed to this board. An individual may represent five percent of the miners today but that very same organization may represent 60 percent next year. Who is to say that 15 percent is a big enough number? Perhaps it should be 80 percent. The point is that 15 percent is an arbitrary figure. I wouldn't want to try and guess why that was chosen, but I do want to say that the Governor should be able to retain the present appointment power which he has. He ought not be forced to get into the intra union or intra-representative politics of what may be going on in that particular field of endeavor. This Gentleman's motion is one which ought to be defeated. The Governor, in his veto message, was absolutely correct. A prior speaker, speaking in the same position that I am, I think very succinctly gave the reason as to why the Governor ought to be maintained. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I strongly urge and hope that the Members vote against the Gentleman's motion and help us to see to it that the Governor's veto is sustained."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Tipsword to close the debate."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, of the other some 30 odd different agencies and commissions and boards



that require qualifications to serve thereon, we have seen no argument. that those qualifications are in any way unreasonable. And those that require that they must represent an organization composed of specific numbers of people who belong to their organization, why would it be unreasonable in this case and in this case only? The previous speaker indicated that perhaps next year the group that now represents 3.3 percent of the miners in the....in the state may represent 60 percent. Well they would certainly be well covered...and would certainly be well representative of miners in the State of Illinois if they represented, as an organization, 60 percent of the miners. and they would fall under this Bill. If they are to be representative truly of miners, certainly 15 percent is not too much. This doesn't require that they be representative of a majority of the miners, but at least that they be representative of enough of the miners that their view is a significant view in representation of people actually working in coal mines in the State of Illinois. That they be representative of persons who actually have experience and know what safety hazards there are in the mines of the State of Illinois. Those who have the experience to know when there exists in a mine in the State of Illinois a safety hazard. I suggest that we need to have people who represent organizations who really represent, truly, those who are the working miners in the mines throughout this state. At the present time we have a gentleman on the board who represents no more than 3.3 percent of the miners in the state if he does that. Certainly if the Governor would take people who are truly representative we would probably have no problem. This just merely requires that they represent only 15 percent of the miners, that there be a substantial number that are members of their organization before their organization may qualify to have a representative upon this board who speaks for miners and for mine safety and for the safety of those who engage in one of



the most hazardous occupations in the State of Illinois. I urge you, I urge you to vote to override the Governor in this behalf and help the Governor to have representation upon the board which he appoints in this very...very important board for the safety of the mines and miners throughout this state that represents the view and can experience and express that which is required for mine safety in the State of Illinois. I urge your override."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2164 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'.. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Do you wish to vote, Mr. Lucco? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. Lucco, 'aye'. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 60 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the Chair recognizes Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request postponement."

Speaker Madigan: "This matter shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mr. Sandquist, House Bill 2243, all day? Mr. Lechowicz, House Bill 2338? Out of the record. Mr. Lechowicz, out of the record on the next two also? Mr. Taylor, House Bill 2375? Out of the record. Mr. Stearney, House Bill 375? Out of the record. Mr. Holewinski, House Bill 413? Out of the record. Mr. Birchler, House Bill 696? Out of the record. Mr. Holewinski House Bill 806? Out of the record. Mrs. Hoxsey, House Bill 978? Out of the record. Mrs. Geo-Karis, House Bill 1454? Out of the record. Mr. Walsh, House Bill 1524? Out of the record. Mr. Bradley, would you come to the chamber, please? On the order ofOn the order of House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2477, Mr. Davis. Jack Davis. Mr. Bradley? Mr. Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like leave of the House to return House Bill 2477 to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."



Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to place House Bill 2477 on the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Is there leave? Leave being granted. The Bill shall be placed on the order of Second Reading. Mr. Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion, I move to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2477, Representative Davis."

Davis: "I would urge the adoption of that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Committee Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee and Mr. Davis has moved to table that Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being no ...Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Byers: "What's the Amendment about, Representative Davis?"

Davis: "I'm sorry, Representative Byers, I didn't understand you."

Byers: "What's the Amendment about? What does it do?"

Davis, J.: "Representative Byers, this was the Amendment that was technically flawed if you'll recall, in the Appropriations Committee. It had to be redone. Consequently we're tabling it and putting in another Amendment that had all to be underlined and it's basically all technical changes. There is no difference in the money items or the transfer items that we discussed in the Appropriation Committee."

Byers: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Davis is absolutely correct. This Bill was heard in the Appropriations II Committee and this Amendment had some technical problems but due to our procedures that we could not amend it on its face....it was decided that this Amendment would be tabled and corrected here on the House floor. So Representative Davis is absolutely correct and I support him in this effort."



Speaker Madigan: "There being no further discussion, the question is, shall Mr. Davis's motion to table Amendment #1 be adopted. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Jack Davis, amends House Bill 2477 on page one, line one and nine and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2, Floor Amendment #2 is indeed and in fact the Bill itself. The Bill as introduced was not in the proper draft, it was a shell Bill and the Amendment now is almost identical except for the technical cleanups...as to the one that we tabled that was heard in the Appropriations II Committee and was adopted by unanimous consent of the Committee. The reason for this Amendment is that the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission has sustained a 25 percent reduction in its fiscal year 1978, Part B, Federal award, which supports agency operations thereby necessitating a transfer within Section 1 of the Bill to meet projected personnel costs. In fiscal year 78 the grants to state agencies were appropriated by major object code according to the new revisions that this General Assembly wished to have the Bills drafted. Revisions in excess of the two percent transfer authority have become necessary so the ...as the grant programs were implemented since July 1. Changes in the levels of support and grant programs to be supported have occurred as a result of other agency priorities for ILEC funding, lapsed period spending and available federal funds. The net effect of the Amendment itself will be to reduce...to reduce the general revenue fund by \$2475that portion of it. And to reduce the federal fund by \$242,531. I would urge your favorable



adoption of Amendment #2 and stand ready to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House adopt Amendment #2? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1390, Mr. Hart. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1390, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1391."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1391, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the Supreme Court for the pay of certain officers in the Judicial System of the State Government. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None.Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading.On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2433. Mr. Barnes.Mr. Polk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2433, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the State Board of Education for the disbursement of certain monies, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House



Bill 2433 passed out of the Education Committee.....er the Appropriations Committee.....Here's Mr. Barnes..... Okay. 21 to nothing. It's \$254,000 but it's all Federal funds. It's grants that we need to get operation- al before September. It's for the...the Department of Education, the old age and the Vietnamese children's programs and would appreciate your positive Roll Call vote on House Bill 2433."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2433 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will everyone please record themselves at this time. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 157 'ayes', 3 'nos'....no voting 'present', and House Bill 2433 having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading there appears House Bill 2434, Mr. Robinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2434, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Services, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "This Bill passed overwhelmingly out of Appropriations Committee. It adds \$30,000 to the Appropriation for the Department of Children and Family Services for services to the blind who are in nursing homes. Most of these are elderly people who are losing their sight. It would provide for three additional staff people to train these people in mobility, in the use of Braille and so forth. There are many people who could live a fuller life this way as well as ending many of the health hazards that these people have in mobility in the nursing homes. We would appreciate a favorable vote."



Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2434 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Would everyone please record themselves right now, please. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 19 'noes', 4 voting 'present', and House Bill 2434 having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, with immediate effective date. House Bill 2464, Mr. Stearney."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2464, a Bill for an Act making....."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stearney in the chamber?..."

Clerk Hall: "....a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Medical Center Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, *(said 2434, meant 2464)* House Bill 2464 would make an appropriation to the Illinois Medical Center Commission of \$550,000. The purpose being to raise a building that is owned by the Medical Center Commission. The property to be used now by Rush Presbyterian St. Lukes Hospital, which is going to build an extension. The extension costing \$72,000,000 but none of it is state money, which will create 15,000 jobs in the near loop area. Now mind you, originally, in the spring this General Assembly did pass a Bill appropriating \$888,000 to the Capital Development Board. The Governor, however, vetoed that saying it was just too much. So what we've done is secured a lower bid. As I understand it, the Governor is in agreement with this. The bid being for \$550,000. I would therefore ask for a favorable Roll Call on this matter."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no discussion, the question is, shall ...Mr. Levin."



Levin: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield..for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Levin: "Does this involve expansion of existing hospital facility?"

Stearney: "Would you repeat the question?"

Levin: "Does this involve the expansion of an existing hospital facility?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Levin: "And what kind of expansion is it? Is it a bed expansion or modernization or what?"

Stearney: "Well it has to be an expansion. It is going to be a new building."

Levin: "Is it going to increase the number of beds or what?"

Stearney: "Pardon."

Levin: "...the number of beds or exactly what kind of expansion is it?"

Stearney: "I don't have exactly all the details, but I presume it's going to add a few beds."

Levin: "Has this been approv...gone before the Health Facilities Planning Board, and been approved?"

Stearney: "I don't know the answer to that question."

Levin: "I would suggest we take it out of the record until we get an answer to that question."

Stearney: "I would respectfully ask the Speaker that I proceed along with this matter."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Stearney, you indicated that originally, in the spring, we passed a Bill which appropriated money from the Capital Development Board, for this project. The Governor vetoed it. Is that correct?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "What was that Bill number?"

Stearney: "I don't have it."



Leinenweber: "So now you've come back with a Bill to appropriate an identical amount of money but this time from.."

Stearney: "No, it's not an identical amount of money. It's \$300,000 less."

Leinenweber: "...But instead of going to the Capital Development Board, you are now going to the General Revenue Fund, is that correct?"

Stearney: "No. It's going to the Illinois Medical Center Commission, which it should have gone to originally."

Leinenweber: "I said it comes from the General Revenue Fund doesn't it?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "So the Governor didn't approve of the money from the Capital Development Fund, do you think he will from the General Revenue?"

Stearney: "Yes, I am told he will. This here property is owned by the Illinois Medical Center Commission..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to allay any fears that our Members might have. This particular piece of legislation is approved by the Bureau of the Budget and has been approved by the Governor's Office and did go through the Committee so we do support it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Deavers: "Representative Stearney, is this the new center for myaglyacin?"

Stearney: "Well...you've misdirected the question. It should be to Representative Collins."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2464 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Mudd to explain



his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think what Representative Peters said a while ago is very true. We had this Bill in our Committee and there was not one objector and I think that the Sponsor even gave a better presentation than than he did here today and I think this Bill merits the support of the House..."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 10 'noes', 7 voting 'present', and House Bill 2464 having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed with an immediate effective date." On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2467, Mr. Taylor."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2467, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for certain claims against the State of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2467 appropriates \$552,928 to the Court of Claims. This is to pay for awards that have been awarded by the Court of Claims during the period of June 9 and October 5. I know of no objections to this Bill and I solicit your support for House Bill 2467."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the case in this particular appropriation is just as Representative Taylor does indicate. It has been gone over by both staffs. These are strictly awards made by the Court of Claims. There are absolutely no controversial measures included in this particular appropriation and we request your approval..."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2467 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have



all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 2 'noes', 2 voting 'present', and House Bill 2467 having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed with an immediate effective date. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading there appears House Bill 2468, Mr. Meyer."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2468, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Governmental Salary Study Committee, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2468 introduced by Mr. Redmond and myself appropriates \$8,000 for the ordinary and necessary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Governmental Salary Study Commission which was created pursuant to House Joint Resolution 22. This Commission is ...has been formed. Its first meeting is November 21, here in Springfield, with Governor Shapiro as Chairman. I urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2468 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ms. Macdonald to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "No, not to explain my vote. On another matter, Mr. Speaker, after the vote is taken."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 26 'noes', 3 voting 'present', and House Bill 2468 having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed with an immediate effective date. On the Order or House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2469, Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "House..."



Speaker Madigan: "Excuse me, Mr. Abramson, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was not at my desk and I would like to be recorded 'yes' on 2468, House Bill 2468."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests leave to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 2468. Leave being granted, she shall be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 2468."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2469, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2469 is a supplemental appropriation appropriating \$4,222 to the Liquor Control Commission from the General Revenue Fund for debts that incurred in fiscal 1977. The Commission exhausted its two percent transfer allowance then over obligated certain line items. In other lines it elapsed enough funds to cover these obligations. Three obligations are involved; travel allowance in the amount of \$2,138 for the agents on duty; contractual services for lab tests in the amount of \$1978; and telecommunications for \$46."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I...Mr. Speaker, I want...Mike, would you take this out of the record. I had asked the Commission to have some information at the Committee and they haven't supplied it as yet. Would you be able to take it out of the record until we get that information?"

Abramson: "Sure."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be taken from the record. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading there appears House Bill 2471, Mrs. Kent."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2471, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Department of Transportation,



Third Reading of the Bill."

Kent: "This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will appropriate \$34,566 to the Department of Transportation for the use by the Department of Aging to study the insurance needs for the vans for the elderly, in the State of Illinois. There is great discrepancy in what is needed, how much is paid, and this grant, coming through with Federal funds, needs to be placed in their hands so that this study can be made. I urge approval of this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2471 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', one 'no', 9 voting 'present'; and House Bill 2471 having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2472, Mr. Reilly."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2472, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2472 which passed, I believe, unanimously, out of Appropriations I makes a supplemental appropriation of \$104,500 to the Department of Agriculture. None of which is from General Funds. One part is a \$57,000 grant for the Federal Agricultural Marketing Fund, which the Department did not know about at the time of its annual appropriation. The other is in the amount of \$44,600, which is a supplemental amount for overtime for grain inspectors and this is a completely



reimbursed program. The Department bills the companies that request the inspection and it's only from that fund that this can be paid. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, do you seek recognition? Would you turn your light off? Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2472 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'noes', no voting 'present', and House Bill 2472, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed....with an immediate effective date. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, there appears House Bill 2473. Mr. Friedland."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue, Third Reading of the Bill."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not the Sponsor of that Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who's the Sponsor of this Bill? Mr. Friedland, the record in the Clerk's office indicates that you are the Sponsor of the Bill."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, the records are kinky then because I'm not the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Who is the Sponsor of this Bill? Mr. Telcser are you involved in this kinky record keeping?For what purpose does Mr. Matijevec arise?"

Matijevec: "Just to recollect Art Telcser's memory. This is the one someone has some fears about amending the RTA...gas.. tax so they gave the Bill to you rather than Friedland."

Telcser: "Oh! I remember now. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2473 appropriates some seven hundred, some odd thousand dollars to the Department of Revenue



for the enforcement of legislation we passed earlier this year which has to do with taxing of vehicles which travel through the state but buy their diesel fuel, I think, out of the state. I understand that ...I think all of the states except one of the adjacent states to Illinois has the same law in their books. It passed out of the Appropriations Committee as I recall with a healthy and I would appreciate a favorable vote. 20 to 3 was the result."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, would you clear the board? Is there any discussion? Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Davis: "Representative Telcser, let me just ask one clear question. I heard your explanation of the Bill. Does this have anything at all to do, ...this financial where-withal, with the Department of Revenue, with the implementation of the five percent gas tax and the RTA in the collar county areas?"

Telcser: "Representative, this Bill at this time has nothing to do with the RTA. To the best of my knowledge it will not ever have anything to do with it...I hope."

Davis: "To the best of your knowledge?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Waddell: "What portion of this has to do with EDP funds?"

Telcser: "I'm not sure what your question is, what portion? There was an Amendment offered in the Committee, which was adopted for \$150,000 for an EDP system. I don't know if that's what your question is but..."

Waddell: "And who gets the EDP systems amount?"

Telcser: "It is my understanding that the Department of Revenue makes that decision and they have already talked withI think Arthur Anderson, that that's what it was for,



my recollection of Committee hearings. Whether they've made a final decision or not I really don't know."

Waddell: "And why Arthur Anderson, when we have sent the amount of money that we have for our own equipment here?"

Telcser: "The Department of Revenue tells me that Arthur Anderson, in their judgment, is equipped to handle the implementation of this Bill in as short a lag time period as possible. Their estimate is four or five months faster than anyone else with whom they have talked, in order to get the Bill implemented."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?Is this an RTA tax?"

Telcser: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Well, are you asking, under this Bill, House Bill 2473, to pass on a special fuel use tax on commercial carriers, are you not?"

Telcser: "No, that tax was already passed during the Session, Representative. What this Bill does is give the Revenue Department some money to implement the tax which this Legislature imposed on trucks who do not buy fuel in Illinois, earlier this year. There are trucks who use our roads but don't help pay for the maintenance of those roads and they don't buy their fuel here and they can go through an adjacent state, buy the fuel there, use our roads and get a tax refund from the state in which they bought the fuel. They use our roads and the roads aren't maintained. And as I say, most of the states, I forget the number, throughout the state I'm told by my colleague here; what 49 states already have this law in their books?er...47 states, I'm sorry. We did this earlier this year, Representative."

Geo-Karis: "I noticed by the Synopsis that Representative Friedland is the Sponsor of this Bill. Is this the same Bill?"



Telcser: "Ah....Representative Friedland found that the workload, which he was under this Session, was much too heavy for him to handle this Bill and he asked me if I could pick it up and since I really didn't have an awful big workload I thought I would help the Representative. He was spending a great deal of time on helping constituents in his district."

Geo-Karis: "I think it's most merciful, humane and compassionate of you, Representative Telcser, to undertake this heavy load for Mr. Friedland."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes. I'm willing to grant, along with Representative Telcser, that the Bill has nothing to do with RTA yet, but I wonder if Representative Telcser would pledge to the General Assembly that, should an Amendment be stuck on this Bill some place, in the Senate say, you know the Chicago Democrats maybe wanting not to have RTA pay for the collection of gas tax; and if he would pledge to table the Bill when it comes back for concurrence? A lot of us would feel a lot easier about voting for the Bill. Would he do that?"

Telcser: "Representative, I would resist every effort made to amend the Bill...."

Skinner: "Will you...."

Telcser: "for an RTA tax. In fact, testimony in Appropriations Committee indicated that the RTA tax still was not adopted by the RTA, I'm not sure that's true or not, but we ...I think you were on the Committee, weren't you Cal, on Appropriations?"

Skinner: "Yes, Art. And I'm just absolutely amazed that you are holding out for the title of the Father of the RTA gas tax. Wouldn't you pledge..."

Telcser: "I'd give it back to Friedland if it's an RTA Bill if it's an RTA Bill."

Skinner: "Well, why don't you just say that you will table the



Bill if it becomes a way to finance the RTA gas tax?

Telcser: "Representative, all I can tell you in all candor and all honesty, this is not....is not intended to be and I will resist with every possible means...if this should become an RTA Bill, which you are very concerned about, frankly I am not quite clear what you have in mind. But I do not intend this to be, nor would let itnor, if it is within my power, let it wind up being an RTA Bill."

Skinner: "Representative, with all due respect, I think the Sponsor has the ability to table a Bill at any time during the course of his handling of it and..."

Telcser: "I couldn't make an honest promise to you that I would table a Billuntil the time at which I may think that the thing is gone....I may have to wait..."

Skinner: "Shucks, I could make that promise...."

Telcser: "...wait until a Conference Committee Report before I decide to dump the Bill....."

Skinner: "I don't want you to....Do you want to pass this Bill?"

Telcser: "Well, sure I do. The way it is now."

Skinner: "Fine."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Rigney: "Art, do I understand that this is to tax these trucks that are crossing the State of Illinois, are not buying fuel in this state....you're saying it's going to cost \$700,000 to enforce that program. Is that correct?"

Telcser: "For the first year only, Representative. As I recall that represents some \$350,000 for the first year start-up costs. The Revenue Department estimates that the annual cost, after the first year, will be \$400,000 a year."

Rigney: "What is the projected..."

Telcser: "I think \$3,500,000 was the projected.....\$3,500,000 to \$5,000,000 a year extra income which I think would go to



the road fund if I'm not mistaken."

Rigney: "In other words, the state road fund is going to get back about \$10 for every dollar that we invest in this program, after the first year's start-up cost?"

Telcser: "Right."

Rigney: "I think it's a good Bill. We've been doing a lot of joking about it but I think it's been an oversight that this state has not had that kind of an enforcement program in years gone by and I hope everybody's going to give this thing an affirmative vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Giglio: "Representative Telcser, this ...Bill, the way I've been listening to the debate, only applies to trucks. What about ...how about cars...?"

Telcser: "Commercial....No, not cars, only commercial trucks."

Giglio: "How about....tugboats..."

Telcser: "...and buses."

Giglio: "...tugboats and marinas that go up and down the water and they buy the gas in the other states?"

Telcser: "Well, if they...if they are in a commercial truck and are being hauled then it would apply to the truck...no barges and tugboats."

Giglio: "It seems as though you are picking on one industry with this Bill."

Telcser: "By the way, I'm not sure whether you are serious or not but...so you know..."

Giglio: "Yeah, I am."

Telcser: "So you know, the Illinois Truckers Association endorsed the Bill."

Giglio: "They did!"

Telcser: "Yeah."

Giglio: "You wouldn't kid me now, would you, Art?"

Telcser: "Giglio, would I kid you?"

Giglio: "That's all, Mr. Speaker. I personally think, truthfully,



that it's just aimed at one group of business people and I think if you're going to be fair I would imagine that that you're going to try to get everybody that buys gas in other states and store it here, we're talking farmers, we're talking of people who use the waterways with the tugboats and with the ...ah...everything else. I don't believe it's a very good Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further...Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I've sat here and listened to this debate and even though we have an illustrious Sponsor, I cannot help but feel that he found this Bill on the beach somewhere because it is undoubtedly a shell Bill. I don't think that we could...can possibly allow a Bill like this to proceed any further for those of us in the outlying area around Cook County we plead to you in downstate to kill this Bill as they will play the same shell game on us as they have done in the past. By taking this money into the Department of Revenue it will undoubtedly free-up other money so they will then have enough money in their budget to take care of the RTA gas tax. All we're asking you is to help those many millions of people lying in the outlying areas around Cook County to cut off this terrible tax which will drive Illinois business and the individuals in our area deeper and deeper in debt and force business out of our state. Even if this Bill was legitimate on it's face, it's going to have a very bad impact upon business in our state, as again we are trying to squirm another few pennies out of those people that are driving trucks through our state. Pretty soon they are going to build a bridge over our state and nobody in business will come near us. I plead with you, if you are downstate, vote against this Bill, let's not give any shell to anyone whether he be a Sponsor from Chicago or if John Friedland eventually has this



Bill again...maybe he will particularly table this Bill.

Let's put this Bill where it belongs...to rest."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in defense of Matijevich's mob, also known as Appropriations I, you'll note that this came out with only three negative votes. It's been repeatedly pointed out to you and you refuse to accept the fact that you're not passing now, on the question of whether or not we would have a tax on out ofstate motorists that use the highways without buying any of our diesel fuel. You decided that back in June. You decided that, 120 to 25, in Senate Bill 664. I have a copy of the Roll. All of you that spoke against it except one voted for the Bill when it passed. Now there's a certain logic that mustn't be lost even on the Illinois House of Representatives. The logic that's involved here is that the Director of the Department of Revenue, Director Whitler, came before our Committee and explained very carefully the start-up costs, the return that would be expected the State of Illinois, the basic fairness of making those that used the roads pay for that privilege and a specific question was asked several times as to what possible implications of RTA and all the threats to each of you. Director Whitler said emphatically that this appropriation in no way, shape or form could be utilized in connection with the hated or dreaded RTA gas tax that's been threatened. That is a 'red herring' that has nothing to do with this case. If you voted for 664, Senate Bill 664, and 120 of you did, you are morally obligated to vote for this if there's any logic whatever. The Bill deserves an 'aye' vote."

Representative Giorgi in Chair.....

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Adams on House Bill 2473."

Adams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I might add that one of the things that has not been brought out is



the fact that we are doing what Iowa and all the neighboring states do now only it is what we call a reciprocity. That means that the people that travel through the state use the roads, pay the same tax as the ones that are traveling within the state. We're not taxing any extra unit. It's got nothing to do with the barges because they are not traveling down the road so that would eliminate that part of the Bill there that someone may be worried about. I, for one, very much encourage the passage of this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich on House Bill 2473."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm almost sorry that Art Telcser didn't realize he was the Sponsor of this because I threw that RTA issue into this and the reason that it's in here is because many of those who have been opposed to the RTA looked and saw this as the only Bill that could be amended to allow for more appropriations to implement a tax. But I think that if we did not pass this we would be doing a disservice to the director who put this Bill in honestly because he ...we had voted to implement Senate Bill 664 and really the agency did not include the calculations for turnover and hiring-lag in implementing it So I would say that we've got to vote for this Bill. Remember there were a couple of Bills during the regular Session that many of the anti-RTA people thought was going to be utilized as a vehicle. We found out that that was all untrue. We made some jokes about it and I really don't think this is going to be used for that purpose either so I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think Representative Telcser has done a superlative job in explaining this Bill and I move the previous question."

Speaker Giorgi: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Telcser to close."



Telcser: "I would simply appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 2473 pass?"

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. This will require 107 votes for immediate 'inaction'. Have all voted who wish? Requires 107 votes for immediate enactment. Representative Telcser to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Do you want to get Totten first? I'll wind it up."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Being from the RTA region I have the same fears as many of us in that region do about possibly using this Bill as a vehicle. I do think, however, though that House Bill 23...2473 was put in because of what we did on the original Bill when we passed it. My only reservations were, how did that Bill slip through without a fiscal note attached to it indicating that the cost would be as astronomical as the Department of Revenue has indicated. I may eat my words when I recommend that we vote 'aye' on this, but I do think that the benefits to the Illinois Road Fund and to Illinois taxpayers has to be thought of because this is a responsible vote, to vote 'aye', I just hope that it doesn't come back over here in some way that it's an RTA issue. But I think at that time those of us who are opposed to the RTA should take up the fight and not cloud up this much needed piece of legislation. I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is no way this Bill can come....become an RTA Bill unless it is amended in the Senate. If it's amended in the Senate, it has to come back here. If it's then an RTA Bill you can then vote 'no' all you want to....then. But as of now it's a vehicle to help us collect tax from those who are crossing the State of Illinois....taking a free ride on us.



That's all it is. When it becomes an RTA Bill, you can vote 'no' then."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steele, do you want to explain your vote?"

Steele, E.G.: "Explain my vote? I'd like to urge that we get more green lights on this. The State of Iowa has a similar Bill and it has brought \$21,000,000 additional revenue for their road fund into that state in only one year. Iowa has only half as many roads as Illinois does. So this is the kind of Bill and the Bill before us is merely to implement and to fund this new Bill which is an excellent Bill and will bring more road funds into our state. Certainly if there is anything we need more funds for it's to help our roads and particularly to get revenue from out of state trucks, the long-haul trucks who buy their fuel out of our state, use our roads day after day and never pay an ounce of motor fuel tax. This is merely to implement that Bill. I think it's excellent. We've already passed the main Bill. This is merely to implement it. It's going to bring millions of dollars into our state and I urge that we do get the Bill passed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my district borders on Wisconsin and my people are interested in the improvement of our highways in Lake County and we do experience what many Members have referred to already and that is the out of state truckers. I think this is good, responsible legislation and I have in the past been one who has been concerned about RTA. If this does turn into a vehicle and come back we'll fight it at that time, but right now the idea of RTA being associated with this Bill is a hobgoblin, it's not there, we should vote on this Bill, on its merits. I think this is a responsible investment for good tax administration and enforcement and I urge more 'aye' votes."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Well...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as has been adequately explained by several of the speakers, this....Senate Bill 664 went out of this House with 120 votes, and that was to bring money into the road fund of the State of Illinois. Now this Bill is simply the start-up money to pay for the enforcement of that legislation. Now there's nothing connected with RTA and to tell you the truth if it is connected with RTA when it comes back from the Senate I'll get up and oppose it too, but I'd like to see us get a few more votes and get the 107 votes and get the road fund built up and get on the way with this legislation because 46 other states already do the same thing."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Byers to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 23 'nays', 14 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the necessary three-fifths majority is passed with an immediate effective date.House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 2474, Representative Kempiners Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a supplemental appropriation for the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation and it consists of either 100 percent federal funds or a transfer within line items of the appropriations for the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. I would ask your support for the passage of House Bill 2474."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? No discussion. The



question is, shall House Bill 2474 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It has an immediate effective date and takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 148 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the necessary three-fifths majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. House Bill 2475."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2475, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2475 appropriates \$54,100 all federal funds, for the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency for the hazardous materials program. This federal supplement will make the possible round-the-clock answering of the Hazardous Material Service emergency phone. Now this is all federal money and this money was not available before passing the FY 78 budget. I urge your affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2475 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. This will take an extraordinary majority of 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 154 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and this Bill having received the three-fifths extraordinary majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. House Bill 2476."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2476, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Business and Economic



Development, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2476 appropriates a supplemental appropriation of a million dollars from the Federal Energy Policy Fund to the Department of Business and Economic Development for the state energy conservation plan. This amount was released by the Federal Government in September of 77 after the original appropriation was made and after we'd adjourned for the summer and I'd like to urge a favorable vote on 2476."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 2476 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and this shall take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 2 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and this 'vote' having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date.and the three-fifths majority. House Bill 2478."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2478, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Service for \$427,000. One hundred percent federal money for existing programs already being carried out by the Department. This is money that came available since we adjourned in June."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any debate? The question....Representative Totten on House Bill 2478."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."



Totten: "Is any of this money.....on grant money, going to be money that will expire in future years so that the state would have to pick up funding on the program?"

Edgar: "We asked that question in Committee and they assured us 'no'. These are all programs that have been funded before, will be continued to fund, when the federal funds run out they do not intend to come in and ask for any down the road. We had that commitment from the Department."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question.....Any further questions? Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to hear some of these Bills to appropriate federal funds in Appropriations I; and I think that probably all of this dialogue that goes on, on some of these Bills ought to be noted very carefully when we reconsider Representative Luft's Bill. I think this last Bill that we just passed was probably one of the ugliest Bills up. The best thing about that Bill was the Sponsor. When you have to find Departments to rush around trying to find a use to spend federal funds at the last minute, come up and take a look at some of the programs and you'll start to realize why Representative Luft's legislation to appropriate federal funds gets more and more realistic all....every day."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Edgar to close."

Edgar: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 2478 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. It will take...it will be 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 153 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and this Bill having received the necessary three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date."



REPRESENTATIVE MADIGAN IN THE CHAIR.....

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2480, Mr. McBroom."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2480, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Aging, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is a supplemental appropriation....involves \$1,800,000. About half of it goes for nutrition and half of it goes for facility renovation. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is shall House Bill 2480 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', no 'nays', one voting 'present', and House Bill 2480 having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed with immediate effective date. House Bill 2481, Mr. Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget, Third Reading of the Bill."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Younge has asked me to hold this Bill for one day. Out of courtesy for her I will do so. So please take it out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be taken from the record. House Bill 2482, Mrs. Martin."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is \$150,000 of federal money supplemental appropriation to FEPC. I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Leverenz: "Is that federal money or state money or...what's it going to be used for?"

Martin, L.: "All federal money."

Leverenz: "That's the first part of the question."

Martin, L.: "It will used to ease the backlogue of cases."

Leverenz: "Employing how many new people?"

Martin, L.: "No other people."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor will...."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Skinner: "....why this Bill is necessary if we don't override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 186? Doesn't the Executive Branch have sufficient authority at the present time to spend all the federal funds it can find?"

Martin, L.: "This is the way that the General Assembly can know of it, Mr. Skinner and I think that's better than just doing it by Executive Order."

Skinner: "So do I, Representative Martin, and I hope you will join me in making sure that 100 percent of the money is appropriated by the General Assembly when the next veto override on 186 comes up."

Martin, L.: "That's the way I voted the first time, Representative."

Skinner: "Excellent judgment as usual, Representative Martin."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Sponsor could



again go back and cover what new programs....I understand there are two new programs and I understand there may be 15 to 30 new people. The model office and the worksharing, 14 to 18 new people.....Previously you said none. Perhaps we should take it out."

Martin, L.: "No. No. No. My error and I hope you forgive it. There is a personnel clause in this Bill. These are things we're already doing and we cut their appropriation from the state. We said, 'find federal funds'. There is a backlogue of 3000 cases. They found the funds. Now they are going to hire some people to start taking care of this. Some of the complaints we're getting is the.... you know, really, because they are not doing the job. They are going to clean up their act and now the Department will work."

Leverenz: "I understand the FEPC has 1200 cases on file that have not been taken care of, and that earlier question I asked was, will it employ any new people? Your answer was 'no'.....and there will in fact be 14 to 18 new employees hired here. Thank you."

Martin, L.: "First of all I apologize for that. If they can get more federal funds they'll hire even more people. I'm sorry for that error. The idea's to use federal funds to start cutting down the backlogue. We heard of 3000,heard 12,000 and your figure may be correct."

Leverenz: "Thank you. And, Mr. Speaker, too, to the Bill, this is another reason that Representative Luft's Bill should be passed. We've got a number of cases here where federal funds are coming in and a number of new ways that they have to find to spend that money without going through the appropriation process completely. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J. : "Will the Sponsor yield and...."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Martin, in the Committee there



was testimony that the Commission had a number of cases pending against itself. Could you make clear how many cases were pending against the Fair Employment Practices Commission, by employees of that Commission?"

Martin, L.: "Representative Houlihan, you are correct, but I still can't remember the number that Ms. Friedrich said. And of course I guess that wouldn't be very fair. She said there were a number of cases...there were some in arbitration, there were some in grievance procedures and I do not remember the exact number. I don't think it was terribly high but you're correct, she said there were some but I did not take those notes, I'm sorry."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this Commission has faltered in its task and its mandate to monitor State Employment Practices, monitor private industry and particularly under this Kern administration what has happened is they've fired the executive director. They canceled his contract with very brief notice and they canceled it without replacing that executive director for some three or four months. I think that this Commission has been leaderless and has been without any ...any real effective way of monitoring some of the most important laws that we have in our state to protect the rights of minorities and individuals who might be discriminated in a job situation and I think that we're in a difficult position because these are additional dollars, but we have no guarantee that this administration will use them effectively."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Lady a question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates she'll yield."

Davis, C.: "I'd like to ask whether or not the Lady who is Chairman of the Commission is still acting as Executive, as the Executive Director?"

Martin, L.: "The new...the new Executive is a Mr. Braxton."



Davis, C.: "Did he...is he active now?"

Martin, L.: "He is. He has just started."

Davis, C.: "I wanted to know because the Lady testified that there was some 4000 cases, I understood, in the Appropriations Committee that needed to be heard and wasn't heard. Do you know how many cases...."

Martin, L.: "Lots of them."

Davis, C.: "...they're sending back to the Federal Government now? You're asking for federal money. How many cases did they send back, ...were unable to handle?"

Martin, L.: "Representative Davis, and I think this may also answer Representative Houlihan. There is no question that this Commission has not performed its job adequately. In fact I think that's one of the reasons they have now a new Director. They are sending too many...if they are sending ten back, that's too many. But I'm sure it is a large number. This is the first step. Now there is a new Director. There are new people. This Commission ... now, I think, has a mandate from this General Assembly to clean up its act; to do the job it's mandated to do. This is a first step in some of the funding from the Federal Government so that they can complete their job. But there is no way I will stand here and tell you they have done their job because they have not."

Davis, C.: "Thank you very much. That's better....they have not, you're right. Most of these cases are women I understand. We're going to be fighting for or against ERA.... and I want the Ladies in here to know that most of these cases are women thatthat are under consideration. I don't think the women have any argument about the question of whether or not a woman ought to receive the same salary as a man if she is doing the same kind of work and I have fought consistently and hard for ERA. I'm going to see what the women are going to do in here when we ask for this money that has been vetoed ...that we were promised



to have...that has been vetoed by the Governor. We're going to ask for it, I want to see what is going to happen here now. We're asking for \$150,000 from the federal government, that isn't a drop in the bucket if you really want an FEPC Commission."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Mrs. Martin to close the debate."

Martin, L. "As you can see this Commission has many problems. I repeat again, this is the first step. It is ...federal money, a supplemental appropriation of \$150,000. I ask you to put aside your suspicions, to give them the chance, under new leadership to perform the task which I am sure we all wish they would do. So I ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2482 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Well, I'm going to vote for this Bill but I'm almost tempted to vote against it because I hear all this talk about poor leadership and I thought Mel Jordan did a heck of a job from where I sat...and I don't want my vote interpreted as a vote against Mel Jordan. I'm going to vote for it because I think they need the funds, but I didn't like the fact that the Sponsor kept talking about poor leadership. I don't think that's it at all. I think it's the volume of complaints that you've got. I don't care who it is you're going to have a lot of problems when you have that much of a volume. I don't think we ought to be up on the floor talking about poor leadership because



Mal Jordan did the best he could and I know from where I sat he did a good job. I vote 'aye!.'

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 5 'noes', 5 voting 'present' and House Bill 2482, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, First Supplemental Calendar, there appears House Bill 2484, Mr. Stuffle."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2484, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, House Bill 2484 basically has four parts, three of which are appropriations of federal money for programs authorized by this House and the General Assembly during the Spring Session. Those three programs deal with the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and financial aid counseling. In House Bill 1076 and 1077, by 147 to nothing vote, we authorized the expenditure of federal money to take the place ...to take the place of current expenditures of General Revenue money in Illinois for the Guaranteed Loan Program, both in payments of defaulted loans and for administrative expenses. Also, in this Bill, is an appropriation for \$308,000 in state money to pay for a deficiency in monetary awards program for fiscal year 1977. This amount is necessary to cover those claims to students who were granted awards on paper, but a deficiency now exists. Of that money, \$298,000 would go to students who are, and were at Central YMCA in Chicago. The other \$10,000 will be used in the residual effect to pick up those other people who were granted awards but were not paid them because of the deficiency. The Bill passed through the Appropriations Committee with their consent and I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call on House Bill 2484."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a point of inquiry. Could the Chair give us some idea as to what's going to happen the rest of the evening here. There is a function that's going on that some of us on this side of the aisle would like to attend....and ..."

Speaker Madigan: "Are you addressing your comments to this Bill, Mr. Ebbesen?"

Ebbesen: "Maybe I'm out of order? I guess I am."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2484 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'.. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 3 'noes', 3 voting 'present', and House Bill 2484, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, with an immediate effective date. Mr. Ebbesen. Is Mr. Ebbesen in the chamber? Mr. Ebbesen? The Speaker wishes to inform you and the other Members that he plans to remain in Session until approximately 8:15 or 8:30. If we move along quickly we'll be out earlier. On the order of Reduction Veto Motions, page 9, there appears House Bill 750. Mr. Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations to House Bill 750, the Reduction of the Governor notwithstanding; page one, line five through nine."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, would you take that out of the record for right now, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, shall we take this out of the record for the remainder of the day?"

Ryan: "That'd be fine with me."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 7....excuse me, House Bill 973, Mr. Gaines."



Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the \$300,000 that the Appropriations Committee of the House added to the basic Fair Employment Practices Bill last spring. It went to the Senate, came back to the House, went to a Conference Committee and survived all of that, and the Governor vetoed it, as a Reduction Veto. As the vulnerable Corneal Davis said, a little earlier, the test of the sincerity of this House, this Legislature, as to whether they really want to solve the employment problem where women and minorities are concerned, they're going to have to provide sufficient funds for our Fair Employment Practices Commission to do the job. We hear about problems they are having, but the bottom line of all the problems is they do not have sufficient funds to hire sufficient staff to do the job that we would all like to have done. So therefore, I am asking you to restore these funds so that our Fair Employment Practices Commission can do the job that they all wanted to do, so that the parents of the people that are coming into the world today can have a decent job. These are people who want to work, not people who are shirking work. So we would rather for you to appropriate it here, than to appropriate it in some boondoggle for someone to get something for nothing. These are people who want to go to work and they've been denied their right to work and they are appealing to the state....and the state is the only person that has a right to go in and investigate and see to it that these persons have an opportunity to work and earn a living rather than to get on public aid....So I am asking for an override of this Reduction Veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gaines, there are several line item vetoes in conjunction with this Bill.....ten to be exact. Do you request leave to take all of these at one time? The Gentleman requests leave that we consider all ten items at one time. Leave being granted, we'll proceed



in that manner. Is there any discussion? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Before anyone stands up and says we don't have the money, we don't have \$264....\$267,400 I hope that they will review their vote on House Bill 2464, which we just overwhelmingly passed. It provided for \$550,000 to tear down a building on a piece of property which the State of Illinois has already sold."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have great respect for the Gentleman from McHenry as she well knows, but to indicate....the Republican Gentleman, Representative Hanahan, I also have a great deal of respect for you; that is not the kind of argument that we can end up using, I think, when we start talking about legislation. Especially legislation that carries with it appropriations. Given that kind of reasoning we can then end up voting for almost any kind of Bill because we have, in our own set of priorities, voted for money for one type of funding or another. What had happened in House Bill 973 is that the Governor had vetoed out \$267,400 in General Revenue Funds. Those funds were vetoed out in anticipation of a \$109,000 of federal funds that were added, plus in anticipation of additional funds which the Department felt it was going to receive this fall. It did receive \$150,000. So, in fact, we have added to this budget, the amounts of money that we are talking about or individuals did talk about when they presented this Amendment or these series of Amendments, for discussion here in the General Assembly. It is also indicated to us by the Department that they anticipate and hope to receive somewhere near another eight hundred to eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars of federal money in order to assist the state in clearing the backlog of cases between the FEPC and the various individuals it represents. A good number of these cases because the



state is picking up the federal litigation in this area. And it's picking it up out of a very sound practical matter is that if the state does not see fit to rule in favor of the individual they go to the federal government anyway. So an agreement has been reached out to kind of short-circuit this kind of system and for the state to pick up a good part of this. That is in the works. I understand that many people feel that the personnel changes made in the Department were not made in the best interest of that Department. I make no comment in that regard. I am not involving myself here in the personalities that may be working or the involvement here. What I am talking about is maintaining in this appropriation and the other appropriations....the fiscal record we did establish last Session and also indicating to you that by the Governor's removal of this \$267,000 we are, in fact, not cutting this Department short because we added \$109,000 of federal funds and now add another \$150,000; for a total of \$259,000 which is almost dollar for dollar what was removed by the veto. The funds can only be spent in a certain amount of time and in a certain way and if you end up appropriating \$10,000,000 for this agency, there's only so much they can do in a given period of time and a given way. I ask that the Governor's veto be sustained."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know all about what the distinguished Gentleman is talking about because I tried so hard and for so many years to make it possible for the state FEPC Commission to handle government cases. I was defeated and beaten back and finally we got initiatory powers giving them the right. Under the distinguished man who is dead and gone, Senator 'Dirksen'... it was his Amendment that gave the state the right to handle those cases but we hear in the House refused to adopt it for many years, but it is a part of



FEPC now. Let me tell you this, if you know anything at all about that agency, you know that the Federal Government has threatened to withhold its money simply because Illinois hasn't met their obligation where FEPC is concerned. They've been spending federal money. Now, on the eighteenth...the seventeenth and eighteenth of this month I hope to be in Nashville, Tennessee attending a black Legislator's...all black Legislator's Convention, where they've come from every section of this Nation. And do you know that the greatest FEPC agency has been pointed out by all of the Legislators, especially the black Legislators, even in New York, all over the Nation, as the finest example of how Fair Employment Practices should be administered, they've pointed out that this Commission here in Illinois is one. What do we have now? Look at the papers. How am I going to explain it. The Lady who's chairman of the Commission has been running the whole show. Every newspaper has been talking about the rows, I hold it in my hand here now, saying that they sent out a Committee to select an executive and that they payed no attention to the Committee.the executives selected. I tell you that Illinois has been been praised. It's one of the prize agencies we have in this state. Now the Gentleman is talking about the General Revenue Fund, well they can take the money....they can take their money from special funds. Let me tell you about some special funds in this state. Such funds already exist, especially in Illinois.....such as construction of a new snowmobile trail, so if we have some snow this.....winter they'll get the snowmobiles and they'll be able to ride over territory that the State of Illinois has made possible for snowmobiles. Let me tell you about some other funds here that we've taken from; from such funds already exist, investigation of the background of racehorses, we can take it from there. The black people, not only in Illinois, but all over this



Nation....and I don't know why they haven't done something about the Humphrey Bill in Washington, the Full Employment Bill, all over this Nation they are crying because they are suffering from unemployment and you better believe they are suffering from unemployment. You mean to tell me it is far better to study the background of a racehorse or to have a snowmobile trail than it is to deal with these problems. The Lady in the Commission the other day said there were four thousand cases unheard and most of them are women. I've been fighting for this ERA, you know I have, fighting for it so much so that I've had some women who are destined to condemn me to the very bitter end, but I think I'm right. I wanted to be free and I recognized the rights, not only of every man, but every woman to be free in this nation. I'm asking you now, we were promised this money, we were promised this \$260,000 that the Gentleman talked about. They appointed a new director, if you don't give the new director the money what in the name of God can he do? What can he do? I ask you to consider the facts....that the man must have some investigators. They told me that they had nine investigators. They don't have but about three or four to send all over downstate Illinois. I tell you, whether you are for ERA or whether you are against ERA, this will be your opportunity to do something to equalize the pay of the women in this State. I ask you now, I sat here, I voted to override, I voted time and time again to override. This is just a drop in the bucket. I ask you, isn't ^{it} more important to vote to give human beings their rights than to study the background of some racehorse? Though I speak with the tongue of men and angels, and have not charity, I'm becoming as a 'sounding' brass and a tinkling cymbal. I ask you hear and now, irrespective of the Governor's Veto to override this Bill and restore that money to the FEPC Agency so this new director,



this new director can live up to the record that has been set, as my friend here said, by Mel Jordan and the Commission. Please.....Please give us this money. This might be my last speech or one of my last speeches but this represents almost twenty years of work for me and I hate to see the finest agency in this state destroyed. I'd hate to have to stand up in Nashville, Tennessee, on the eighteenth and tell them that our FEPC is going down the corridors of time. They have no money to carry out the mandates of the people in this state.... I plead with you, I voted with you over there. I admired your Governor when he took a stand for poor women and I still admire him. I'd defy anybody who would attack him because of that stand he took. And I'm asking you now to help this situation. In my district.....In my district there are more young people walking around begging for opportunity to work and no opportunity is given them. Please.... Please restore this money."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the reduced items of appropriation on page one, lines 12, 16, 19, 24, 27, 30, 33 and page 2, lines 3, 6, and 9, of House Bill 973 be restored to their original amounts, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all of those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "I wish to comment on a misunderstanding that Mr. Peters had. His memory isn't quite as good as his judgment is sometimes. The \$109,000 he's talking about was added before this other money was added. So, therefore, it was not a replacement for the money that we're talking about. In addition, some federal funds have also been dried up. They tell you about some funds that have been added, but \$169,000 has been challenged in terms of big government asking for it back. So therefore there are not enough funds to do the job that this money was appropriated for.



Now everyone here has been asking, what can we do to honor Corneal Davis's retirement? The best way you can honor him is to put this money back in the budget. Give him a sendoff that he'll remember for the rest of his life. He devoted his life to this Bill and this agency cannot survive, I don't care who you put in charge of it, if you don't give them some money to work with. And also, as Representative Davis said, some of us have been in touch with Washington also and Washington has been telling us that unless the state puts some money into the bucket, that they are going to take some of their money out. Now, that's what Washington said. So if you want to continue to depend on Washington, and then you object when the Federal Government puts various and sundry rules on you. You can't have it both ways. So I'm asking you to restore these funds so the Fair Employment Practices Commission can do the job for which it was created."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any ...Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Nothing."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Ms....Mr. Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, our colleague, Representative Davis has associated his vote with this subject with adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment. I am just as fervently opposed to that Constitutional Amendment as he is in favor of it. And every time I receive a letter on ERA I tell my constituents, if you have a problem of sex discrimination, you don't have to amend the Constitution of the United States, all you have to do is pick up your telephone and call Chicago and if you've got a grievance or a complaint, file it there, I'll help you fill out the complaint. They will solve your problems of sex discrimination. Now if those of us who oppose ERA suggest that we can solve our problems here



in Illinois that way, I think that it's responsible of us to give that agency, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, the money they need to enforce the equality of opportunity that we want for all Illinois citizens, men, women, all persons in the State of Illinois. I think a responsible vote is a 'yes' vote and I urge all of you to vote 'yes' for this appropriation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, the previous speakers have spoken so eloquently that we do have the requested number of votes to restore this money to this much needed Commission. The only thing I can add is, I appreciate those votes because it does take 18 months now to get a case on sex discrimination heard. We have added the responsibility, the minority groups, the women, handicapped and the aging, without adding appropriations to this agency. I'm delighted to see those votes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any furtherhave all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question,on these questions, there are 95 'ayes', 55 'noes', 5 voting 'present', and Mr. Telcse requests a verification of the Roll Call. The Clerk shall poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt, Conti, Epton, Ewing, Hoffman, Hudson, Huskey, Klosak, Laurino, Lynn Martin, Matejek, Mautino, McAvoy, McGrew, Meyer, Polk, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schuneman, Tipsword, Wall, and Winchester."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk proceeds with a poll of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim



Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matijevich, McClain, McLendon, McPike, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, R. V. Walsh, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Sandquist, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Van Duynes, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? What's the starting count?"

Clerk O'Brien: "95 'ayes'."

Speaker Madigan: "95 'ayes'. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Representative Antonovych?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Antonovych? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Birchler."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birchler is in the chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Antonovych has returned to the chamber. Restore the Gentleman to the Roll Call. Mr. Farley is in the front of the chamber."

Telcser: "Mr. Huff?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff is in his chair."

Telcser: "Capparelli?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli is in his chair."

Telcser: "Christensen....is that he in his seat?"

Speaker Madigan: "Christensen is in his chair."

Telcser: "Representative Garmisa?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa is in his chair."

Telcser: "Representative Hart.....I see him in his seat.

Representative Dawson?"



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dawson? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Kelly?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kelly? Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"

Remove him from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich....is in the chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Leverenz?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz is in the chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Luft?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Luft is in the chamber."

Telcser: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker.....Wait...Wait,
one second. I'm sorry. Representative Schneider?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Schneider recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Tipsword?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tipsword?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Madigan: "Not recorded?...."

Telcser: "Representative Mann?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mann is in the chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Williams? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call. Mr.
Levin has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Levin to
the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Willer?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Willer? How is the Lady recorded?"



Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove her from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Yourell?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Mugalian?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mugalian? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are 88 'ayes', 55
'noes', 5 voting 'present'....For what purpose does Mr.
Pechous arise?"

Pechous: "How am I recorded on this Roll Call?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Pechous: "Please....mark me 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'....Mr.
Sandquist. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Change Mr. Sandquist to 'present'. Mr.
Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Mulcahey recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'.
Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Mautino recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Mautino: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Any further
changes? On this question there are 89 'ayes', 55 'noes',
5 voting 'present', this motion having received a Con-
stitutional Majority prevails and the items previously



enumerated on the pages previously enumerated, of House Bill 973 are restored to their original amounts, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. For what purpose does Mr. Collins arise?"

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, did you announce there were 89 votes on that Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, I did."

Collins: "I see Representative Breslin is voting and I'd like to register my dissent at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "That dissent shall be made a part of the record. On the Order of Reduction Veto Motions there appears House Bill 2381, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2381 was the appropriation for the Secretary of State and within that appropriation budget was an Amendment placed on the Bill in Committee approved by the Committee with a 25 to nothing vote. It was put on by Ralph Dunn, Representative Dunn. The Secretary of State, Mr. Dixon, supported the 2.2 million dollars for additional dollars for the library system in Illinois. We have 570 public libraries and the 18 systems supply and support the 570 public libraries we have in Illinois. The Governor, in his Amendatory Message, suggested that that when we do not have additional funds for education, that he didn't see how he could possibly give an increase in dollars to the ...to the library systems in Illinois. However, he didn't take into consideration the fact that those systems have not had an increase in dollars in three consecutive fiscal years. And this would be the fourth consecutive fiscal years... year if we are not able to restore the 2.2 million dollars to the system. I'm suggesting then that it's time, as we know the inflation has eaten up all of our various agencies in Illinois government and most of them, to the best of my knowledge, have had an increase in funds, at least in the last four



years. If we do not supply this 2.2 million at this time, of new dollars, as suggested by Representative Dunn in his Amendment, they're going to go four years and consequently next year when we come back in for additional dollars we would be even further in arrears,.....and that agency would be, than most other agencies in Illinois. So I suggest that we do find the additional dollars. That we do override or return the reduced amount to the full amount, as we did when we originally passed 2381, and I so move, Mr. Speaker and Representative Dunn may want to address himself to this motion because it was and is his Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is another library Bill. This one does cost some money but this Bill was passed by the House by a vote of 140 to one.....when it passed the House. It is in the Secretary of State's budget. Secretary of State Alan Dixon appeared before the Appropriation's Committee and he certainly approved when I introduced and passed the Amendment.....putting on the additional money...for libraries. As Representative Bradley said, there's not been any new money for the libraries in the State of Illinois for the past four years. Governor Thompson...Governor Walker reduced it, Governor Thompson did not increase it back to where it was before....the previous administration. This is a Bill of 2.2 million for all of the libraries in the State of Illinois....for funding for the libraries under this system of grants. It's not for construction, this is for operation of libraries. I certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall the.....Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's awfully difficult to be against a thing as nice as



libraries, that everyone believes in, but there is a higher responsibility and that's fiscal. In this particular situation the Governor has spelled out and detailed that none of you can miss. The money simply isn't there. It's no argument to say that one segment of society is entitled to full funding, there are many many facets of guise in government throughout Illinois and none of these are fully funded. We must not, regardless of how fond we are of the library system, we must not treat it as a special child and just waste all of the assets of the State of Illinois and of the taxpayers therein, on this particular project. Our duty calls this stern responsibility and we should be voting 'no' here to sustain the hand of the Governor in the interest of all the citizens and all the other causes throughout the state that are worthwhile. Don't be swept away here with a notion that the libraries somehow should be entitled to special treatment. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is.....Mr. Hart..... The question is, shall the reduced item....Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Just like to close, Mr. Speaker. We're not suggesting that libraries in ...library system in Illinois be given any special treatment at all as the last speaker might suggest. We're just asking that they be given the same treatment that other agencies in the State of Illinois be given. As I said in my opening remarks, it's been some three years since there has been an increase in funds. And I don't think that the prior speaker could indicate to me any other agencies in the State of Illinois that have gone any longer without any additional dollars than the library system has gone. This isn't imperative and there won't be a breakdown in the library system but in order to provide the kind of services those....some 18 library systems give our public libraries....if we want to



continue to supply the books to our young people, and to our senior citizens and to everybody in the State of Illinois that needs some help, then we ought to go ahead and for the first time increase their appropriation, give them some extra dollars. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, then the question is, shall the reduced item of appropriation, on page ten, lines 31 to 35 of House Bill 2381, be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Secretary of State and the tradition of past Secretaries of State has really done a great job in trying to institute a good library system throughout the State of Illinois. Many of us remember during the Regular Session, that people from our districts came to us and told us how important the establishment of a good library system is to our district. I think we ought to recognize it as a high priority. Really it is, I think, in the same line of priority with education and the benefits of a good library system we can really never measure. We all recognize that if our libraries are full that we are really telling the people of the State of Illinois that we are doing all that we can to have a good education for people, not only the youth of Illinois but the adults too. A good library system always will reap benefits in the future and we, as the General Assembly, should stand for that good library system by restoring these funds and I would recommend and wholeheartedly endorse an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Ms. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote it seems to me that since the Secretary



of State originally requested the figure that was granted to him and then more money was put on in Committee, in order to provide full funding for the library grant formulas. It seems to me that since the amount, without the addition, should provide for the grants increase over a full year of 77, but at a percentage equal to the percentage increase for education, I think the Governor's word should be heeded in this instance and there is no sense kidding ourselves, that we can give a percentage equal to the percent increased for education, we have business going higher here and the library people know I'm a great supporter. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ralph Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House Members that the new funding level for libraries this year, if we had fully funded them, would have amounted to 8 million dollars. The Library Association along with consultation with legislative leaders thought that probably because of tight money, 30 percent of that would be enough. That was the reason we had a 2.2 million dollar increase this year and as I said earlier, it passed the House by a good big vote and I would urge that you help us restore this for all of your libraries. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ryan to explain his vote."

Ryan: "I'd like to verify at the proper time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 51 'noes', one voting 'present', ...Mr. Ryan has requested a verification of the Roll Call. Mr. Bradley requests a poll of the absentees. The Clerk shall proceed with a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett, Bluthardt, Brandt, Conti, Daniels,



Epton, Ewing, Friedrich, Hoffman, Hudson, Huskey, Johnson, Keats, Kent, Klosak, Lauer, Laurino, Madison, Lynn Martin, Matejek, McAvoy, McGrew, Meyer, Molloy, Polk, Schlickman, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Waddell, Wall, Wikoff, and Winchester."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed with the verification of the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, E. M. Barnes, Beatty..."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Waddell arise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Waddell: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Collins, Carrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Dómico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matijevech, Mautino, McClain, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, O'Brien, W.D. Walsh, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Ryan: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have some questions. Representative Don Brummet."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummet is in his chair."



Ryan: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Byers is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Collins. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Doyle is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Madigan: "Ralph Dunn.....is in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Ewell?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Garmisa?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Giorgi on the floor?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative who?"

Ryan: "Never mind. Representative Hanahan here?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hanahan? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "He is in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kane is in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schisler is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Katz from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Kelly."



Speaker Madigan: "Representative who?"

Ryan: "Kelly."

Speaker Madigan: "Kelly? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative McLendon?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McLendon is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Kozinski?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kozinski? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Unknown: "Not voting."

Ryan: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman...."

Speaker Madigan: "He's on this side....he's in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Gaines?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gaines? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Gaines from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Mugalian?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mugalian? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Williams? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Willer?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Willer? How is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "She's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove her from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Schneider?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schneider is in the chambers."

Ryan: "Representative Farley?"



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Huff?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Yourell? Yourell?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yourell? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Von Boeckman?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Von Boeckman is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Pierce?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pierce, he's in the chamber. Mr. Bradley,
for what purpose do you arise?"

Bradley: "Rather than take up more time of the House, it
appears we don't have 89, With the leave of the House
I'd like to have it placed on postponed consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "The matter shall be placed on postponed
consideration. On the Order of Reduction and Item Veto
Motions there appears House Bill 2379. And with respect
to that Bill, there appears a motion to restore a reduced
item of appropriation, on page 18, line 5 through 12 and
13 and 14. And all of that shall be stricken from the
record. The Parliamentarian informs me that, on the
Calendar, under Item Vetoes appears a motion with respect
to House Bill 2379, to override the Governor's veto of
the item at page 18, lines 5 through 12 and 13 and 14.
And with respect to that motion the Chair recognizes Mr.
McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, point of inquiry. Would the Chair con-
sider taking this matter out of the record at this time?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sponsor.....Mr. McClain, that appears to
be the prerogative of the Sponsor of the Bill.



McBroom: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, Representative McClain and I have been discussing this. It's fine with me if he wants to take it out."

McClain: "Thank you very much. Everything I said about you is true, Eddie."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Reduction and Item Veto Motions there appearsMr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Parliamentary Inquiry. Are we still on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

McBroom: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "...There appears an Item Veto Motion with respect to page 43, line 17 and 20.....17 through 22. And with respect to that motion the Chair recognizes Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this taken out of the record if I could."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker...did Representative Van Duyne ask to have this taken out of the record?"

Van Duyne: "Yes I did."

Speaker Madigan: "I'm told Mr. Van Duyne has requested that this be taken out of the record."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's fine with me also. Representative Van Duyne is my neighbor and my friend. Are we going towould it be an appropriate suggestion to maybe start all over on this Bill tomorrow or...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McBroom, the Speaker informs me that he wishes to take this Bill out of the record and to proceed toward adjournment. In that regard, on the Second Supplemental Calendar, there appears House Bill 2479. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bradley for purposes of a motion."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to suspend Rule 33 (a) so that this would move House Billand request that we move House Bill 2479 to the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day now."



I request leave to do that."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave and Mr. Walsh seeks recognition."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I object to the Gentleman's motion. I would appreciate it if he would tell us why he is making the motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, we would like to move it to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, so that we would have it on Third Reading tomorrow, so that we could pass the Bill and get it on over to the Senate. It is the Bill sponsored by the Speaker of the House. If he has some clarification regarding the Bill perhaps he can enlighten you also, Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we had thisthis Bill came up in the Rules Committee and it was exempted and I voted to exempt it so that it could be heard. But I certainly had no thought of it being put on the floor without a Committee hearing. This is a....."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Walsh, this Bill was heard by the Executive Committee this morning while you were in the Rules Committee."

Walsh: "It was heard by the Executive Committee?"

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill has been reported favorably by the Executive Committee and because of that recommendation, now appears on the Calendar of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Mr. Bradley is attempting to simply save one day."

Walsh: "All right. I have no objection to that."

Speaker Madigan: "...And Mr. Walsh removes his objection.

Leave is granted and the Attendance Roll Call shall be used for that purpose and the Gentleman's motion carries. The Bill shall be read a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2479, a Bill for an Act to provide



for representation and indemnification in certain civil law suits, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement...for the First Special Session, when we get into that. Are we in the First Special or the Second?"

Speaker Madigan: "No, Mr. Bradley. Are there any further matters in the Regular Session? Regular Session. Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1385, which is an appropriation to the State Treasurer's Office, a transfer Bill, has been approved by Mr. Ryan and the Treasurer has to talk to Mr. Ryan now. It's an agreement from both sides of the aisle. We'd like to move to the appropriate rule and be read a second time, be Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Unknown: "I didn't approve."

Speaker Madigan: "Did it appear on the Calendar, Mr. McClain?"

McClain: "It's filed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McClain, might you consult with the Majority Leader on that Bill and we'll go on to other matters right now? Are there any further matters in the Regular Session? Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I thought that many of the Members would like to know that we have a former Alderman of the 43rd Ward and a candidate for the United States Senate with us this afternoon, Billy Singer."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further matters in the Regular Session? Mr. McClain, do you wish to....because we are going to adjourn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading."



Speaker Madigan: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2515, Robinson, a Bill for an Act to protect the confidentiality of information and records of rape crisis organizations, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain at Mr. Garmisa's chair."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've appropriately now seen the Majority Leader and I would again move that the appropriate rule be suspended and the matter be taken from the Committee on Assignments and bypass Committee and be moved to Second Reading, Second Legislative."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill number, Mr. McClain?"

McClain: "I have talked to Mr. Ryan."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill number, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Senate Bill 1385."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 1385. The Gentleman moves to advance the Bill to the order of Second Reading without reference to Committee. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Mr. McClain now requests leave that the Bill be placed on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there leave? Leave being granted, it shall be place on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. The Clerk shall read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1385, amends an Act making appropriation to the State Treasurer, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Are there any further matters in the Regular Session? Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "For the purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to remind you that the Motor Vehicle Committee meeting will be at 9 a.m. in the



morning, in room C-1. We will discuss the license plates That's staggered registration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there anything further in the Regular Session? There being nothing further, the Chair recognizes Mr. Lechowicz,.....who wishes to move for adjournment until noon tomorrow in the Regular Session."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House stand adjourned until noon tomorrow, on November 8."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz moves that the House stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. For what purpose does Mr. Houlihan seek recognition, at Mr. Sharp's chair?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in that Third Special Session I have Legislation which would require local Assessors of...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan, let us adjourn the Regular Session.....and the motion carries and the Regular Session stands in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow."



FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

November 7, 1977

Speaker Madigan: "The First Special Session shall be called to order. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 37, Johnson-Kozinski, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code of 1961, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "We're in the First Special Session now, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, being the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 26, I would...now like to request that Speaker Redmond be made the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 26, with Cosponsors of Bradley, Stuffle, Robinson, Byers, Laurino, Madigan and Lechowicz. And everybody...all the rest of the Democrats that would like to be on it we'd be very happy to have them and the Republicans also. I said all of you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley, would restate your motion?"

Bradley: "Being Chief Sponsor of the House Bill 26, in the Special Session, First Special Session, I would like to be removed as the Chief Sponsor and place the name of Speaker Redmond as the Chief Sponsor along with hyphenated Bradley-Stuffle, et cetera, I can come down and give those to you...Robinson-Byers-Laurino-Madigan and Lechowicz."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Gentleman's motion carries and the sponsorship is changed in accordance with his desire.. Anything further in the First Special? For what purpose does Mr. Houlihan arise in the First Special Session?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, is that the Bill I was referring to that amends the Election Code and requires that election of Assessors have served as chairmen of Economic and Fiscal Commissions in counties of 500,000 or over."

Speaker Madigan: "Don't act precipitously in this one now."

Houlihan: "I was just asking for information so that I could make a judgment."



Speaker Madigan: "Anything further in the First Special Session?"

The Chair recognizes Mr. Lechowicz for a motion and Mr. Lechowicz moves that the First Special Session stand in adjournment until 12:10 tomorrow. All those in favor of that motion signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the First Special Session stands in adjournment until 12:10 tomorrow."



Second Special Session

November 7, 1977

Speaker Madigan: "The Second Special Session shall be called to order. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed the Bill with the following title, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bill #6, passed by the Senate November 7, 1977, Second Special Session, by a three-fifths vote, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask unanimous consent to suspend the proper rule on the six and a half day posting so as that Senate Bill 6 can be heard in the Labor and Commerce Committee at 9 a.m., tomorrow morning."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall read the Bill for the first time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 6, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the the Unemployment Insurance Act, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill has been read a first time. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Who is the House Sponsor of that Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the House Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ryan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan is the House Sponsor of the Bill."

Ryan: "All right, now that we know whose Bill it is, what is Representative Jacobs' motion on my Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs, in an attempt to accomodate the possible passage of your Bill, has attempted to suspend the posting requirements to provide for a hearing of the



Committee on Labor and Commerce, tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, on your Bill."

Ryan: "A Bill of this importance you want to bypass...you want to suspend the posting rule? Is that it? You mean you don't want anybody to come in? Is that it, Mr..... I don't have any objection, Mr. Speaker. That's all right."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs requests leave that the posting requirements be suspended to accommodate the hearing of Senate Bill 6, in the Second Special Session, tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. in a meeting of the Labor and Commerce Committee. Is there any objection? There being no objection, that motion carries and the posting requirements are suspended to provide for a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Commerce tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. In which room, Mr. Jacobs?"

Jacobs: "...122-B."

Speaker Madigan: "...122-B. Is there anything further? There being nothing further, the chair recognizes Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until 12:20 tomorrow."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz moves that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until 12:20 tomorrow. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Third Special Session stands in adjournment until 12:20 tomorrow."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.	1:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	Recess till 2:00
	2:00	do do	House to order Roll Call for attendance
2.		Clerk Hall	Constitutional Amendment HJRCA #37, First Reading
3.		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	Committee Reports
		Speaker Redmond	Introduction and First Reading
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Redmond	Reading of Journal
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Madigan	Move dispense....etc..
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
		Madigan	Excused absence
4.		Speaker Redmond	Recess Regular Session First Special Session to order
		Madigan	Roll Call, etc.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Journal
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Move dispense...etc. Motion carries.
	2:10	Clerk O'Brien	HB-21, 2nd Reading, no C.A.
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Madigan	
5.		Speaker Redmond	First Special Session recess..



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
5. (cont.)			Second Special Session to order.
		Madigan	Roll Call, etc.
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Mudd)	Leave to suspend rule HB-2497
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reading of Journal
6.		Madigan	Dispense, etc.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-4, 2nd Reading; Am. 1,2,3,4 and 6 adopted.
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-5, 2nd Reading, no C.A.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #1 and 2 withdrawn, floor Am. #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		arnes, E.M.	Amendment #3
7.		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	Oppose
	2:20	Speaker Redmond	Am. #3 lost, Third Reading
8.		Clerk O'Brien	HB-6, 2nd Reading, Am. #1 adopted.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9.		Friedrich	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Redmond	Am. #2 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Am. #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	Oppose
10.		Speaker Redmond	Am. #3 fails
		Collins	'No on Amendment #1'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Martin, P.	HB-5, Am. #3, leave for 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Recess, Second Special Session
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	Motion (HB-2497)
11.		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourell	Leave
		Speaker Redmond	Regular Session in order... (HB-2497) Leave granted.
		Yourell	Leave to waive post rule on HB-2450.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Announcement. Introduction Robert Walsh
		Speaker Redmond	
12.		Walsh, R.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Move suspend rule, HB-2435.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2461, 2nd Reading, no C.A.
13.		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2462, 2nd Reading, Am. #1 adopted.
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2463, 2nd Reading, Am. #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2470, 2nd Reading, Am. #1 & 4 adopted.
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Am. #5
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:35	Leverenz	Amendment #5
		Speaker Redmond	
14.		Madigan)	Question
)	
		Leverenz)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kozubowski	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
15.		Cunningham)) Kozubowski)	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		REPRESENTATIVE GIORGI IN CHAIR.....	
Lç.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ryan)) Kozubowski)	Question
17.		Speaker Giorgi	
	2:45	Ewell	
		Speaker Giorgi	
18.		Madigan	Responds to Ryan
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Gaines	
19.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Madison	Parliamentary inquiry, Germaneness?
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madigan)	Responds to Madison
)	
		Madison)	
20.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kozubowski	to close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mann	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #6 adopted
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #7
21.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Giorgi	
22.	2:51	Bluthardt)	
)	
		Leverenz)	
23.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leverenz	to close
		Giorgi	Amendment #7 adopted
24.		Clerk Hall	Amendment #8
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kent	
		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #8 adopted, 3rd Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2489, 2nd R.; Am. #1 adopted
		Speaker Giorgi	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2492, 2nd R.; no C.A.
25.		Speaker Giorgi	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2494, 2nd Reading; Am. #1 adopt



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	Third Reading, HB-2494... HB-2495
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2495, 2nd Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Madigan	Question
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2495, 2nd Reading, no C.A.
		Speaker Giorgi	Third Reading
26.		Davis, J.	H-245, Motion to override.
27.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kelly)	Question
)	
	3:05	Davis, J.)	
28.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kempiners)	Yield?
)	
		Davis, J.)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
29.		Willer)	Yield?
)	
		Davis, J.)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kosinski	Address the motion
		Speaker Giorgi	
30.		Brummer)	Yield?
)	
		Davis, J.)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kane)	Yield?
)	
31.		Davis, J.)	
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Robinson)	Yield
)	
		Davis, J.)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Davis, J.	to close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Davis, J.	Explain vote.
	3:14	Speaker Giorgi	HB-245, Override
32.		Cunningham	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Beatty	HB-651, Motion to override
		Speaker Giorgi	
34.		Johnson)	Yield
)	
	3:18	Beatty)	
35.		Speaker Giorgi	
36.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Bennett	Support
37.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mautino	
38.		Speaker Giorgi	
39.		Ebbesen	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Giorgi	Illinois Info Service shoot film.
40.		Houlihan, D.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
41.		Speaker Giorgi	
42.		Waddell	Move previous question
		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:35	Beatty	to close
43.		Speaker Giorgi	shall HB-651 pass?
		Brummer	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Griesheimer	Verify if 107 votes...
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Beatty	poll absentees
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	
44.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Griesheimer	request verification
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Giorgi	Oral Roll Call
45.		Clerk O'Brien	
46.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Polk	votes 'aye'
47.		Speaker Giorgi)	
)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Martin	Votes 'aye'
		Beatty	PPC, HB-651



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
48.	4:00	Collins	HB-1109; motion to override
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Giorgi	
49.		Collins	to close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Collins	Explain vote
50.		Speaker Giorgi	HB-1109, override...
		Jaffe	HB-1185, motion to override
51.		Speaker Giorgi	
52.		Leinenweber	Vote to sustain
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Johnson	
		Spekaer Giorgi	
53.		Jaffe	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Davis, J.	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
54.		Peters	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Stearney	
55.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Geo-Karis	
56.		Speaker Giorgi	
	4:21	Johnson	Possible verification
		Speaker Giorgi	HB-1185; override



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
57.		Mugalian	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Johnson	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	Calls Affirm. Roll Call
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Houlihan, J.	Asks to be verified
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Porter)	
)	
		Speaker Giorgi)	Asks to be verified
)	
58.		Bradley)	
)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
59.		Johnson	Questions Affirm. Roll
60.			
61.		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Giorgi	HB-1185, OVR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-1975
		Breslin	HB-1975, move to OVR
62.		REPRESENTATIVE MADIGAN IN CHAIR.....	
63.		Speaker Madigan)	
		Leinenweber)	Yield?
64.		Breslin)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Breslin	
		Bowman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
65.		Speaker Madigan	HB-1975, Postponed Consideration
	4:40	Clerk O'Brien	HB-1218
		Speaker Madigan	Order of Total Veto Motions
		Dunn, R.	H-1218, move to override
66.		Madigan	
		Barnes, E. M.	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
67.		Skinner	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
68.		Yourell	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, R.	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
69.		Beatty	Asks for 'green' vote.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Hoffman	Doesn't believe we can afford this.
		Speaker Madigan	
70.		Ewing	Oppose
		Speaker Madigan	
71.		Yourell	'No money involved'
		Speaker Madigan	
		Hart	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
		Anderson	Supports
		REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY IN CHAIR	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dunn, R.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
72.		Dunn, R.	HB-1218, Postponed Consideration
	4:55	Speaker Bradley)	
		Houlihan, D.)	Leave to hear HB-2126 & 2173 together
		Speaker Bradley	
73.		Lauer	
74.		REPRESENTATIVE MADIGAN IN CHAIR.....	
75.		Speaker Madigan	
76.		Houlihan, D.	
77.		Speaker Madigan	
		Leinenweber)	Question
		Houlihan, D.)	
78.			
79.			
80.		Speaker Madigan	
		Telcser	Opposed to override
81.		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, D.	to close
82.		Speaker Madigan	HB-2126 and HB-2173
		Getty	Explain vote
83.		Speaker Madigan	
		Satterthwaite	Explain vote
		Speaker Madigan	
84.		Catania	Explain vote
85.		Speaker Madigan	
		Ewell	Explain vote
		Speaker Madigan	
86.		Stiehl	Explain vote.
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
87.	5:26	Darrow	Explain vote.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lauer	Explain vote.
88.		Speaker Madigan	PFC-HB-2126 and 2173
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2164
		Speaker Madigan	HB-2164
		Tipsword	HB-2164, Move to Override
89.		Speaker Madigan	
		Hart	Asks for override
90.		Speaker Madigan	
91.		Stuffle	urges 'aye' votes.
92.		Speaker Madigan	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Tipsword	
93.		Speaker Madigan	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Madigan	Calls; HB-2243, 2338, 2375, 375, 413,696, 806, 978, 1454, 1524...all out of record.
94.	5:47	Davis	HB-2477, leave to return to Second
		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads motion
		Davis, J.	Motion to table Am. #1
		Speaker Madigan	
		Byers)	Yield
)	
		Davis, J.)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
95.		Speaker Madigan	
		Barnes, E.M.	Supports motion
		Speaker Madigan	Motion carries, Am. #1 tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Am. #2
		Davis, J.	
96.		Speaker Madigan	Am. #2 adopted, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB-1390, 2nd R.; no C.A.
		Speaker Madigan	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB-1391, 2nd R.; no C.A.
		Speaker Madigan	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2433, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Polk	
97.		Speaker Madigan	HB-2433...passed
		Robinson	HB-2434, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
	5:55	Robinson	Sponsor
98.		Speaker Madigan	HB-2434...passed
		Clerk Hall	HB-2464, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Stearney	Says '2434' incorrect
		Speaker Madigan	
99.		Levin)	Yield?
)	
		Stearney)	
		Speaker Madigan	
100.		Leinenweber)	Question
)	
		Stearney)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Peters	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Deavers)	Yield?
)	
		Stearney)	
		Speaker Madigan	
101.		Mudd	
		Speaker Madigan	HB-2464...passed
		Clerk Hall	HB-2467, Third Reading
		Taylor	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Peters	
102.	6:05	Speaker Madigan	HB-2467...passed
		Clerk Hall	HB-2468, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Meyer	
		Speaker Madigan	
103.		Macdonald	
		Speaker Madigan	Passed
		Macdonald	Recorded 'yes' on 2468
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2469, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Abramson	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, J.	Asks to be TOOR
		Abramson	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk Hall	HB-2471, Third Reading
104.		Kent	
		Speaker Madigan	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB-2472, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
105.		Reilly	
		Speaker Madigan	Passed
	6:12	Clerk Hall	HB-2473, Third Reading
		Friedland	Not Sponso:
		Speaker Madigan	
		Friedland	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Matijevich	
106.		Telcser	Sponsor of HB-2473
		Speaker Madigan	
		Davis)	Yield
)	
		Telcser)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Waddell)	
)	
107.		Telcser)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Geo-Karis)	
)	
108.		Telcser)	
		Speaker Madigan	
109.	6:20	Skinner)	
)	
		Telcser)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
110.		Rigney)) Telcser)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Giglio)) Telcser)	
111.	6:23	Speaker Madigan	
112.		Griesheimer	(Shell Bill) Kill the Bill
		Speaker Madigan	
		Cunningham	Support
113.		SPEAKER GIORGI.....	
		Adams	on HB-2473..we are doing the same as other states. Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	reciprocity
		Matijeovich	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McBroom	Moves previous question
		Speaker Giorgi	Moved
114.		Telcser	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Telcser	Explain vote. Yields to Totten
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Totten	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Friedrich	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
115.		Steele, E.G.	Supports



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Deuster	Urges 'aye' votes.
116.		Speaker Giorgi	
	6:34	Campbell	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2474, Third Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kempiners	Sponsor
		Speaker Giorgi	148 'ayes'; no 'nays', passed
117.		Clerk O'Brien	H-2475, Third Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Anderson	Sponsor
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed, Extraordinary majority
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2476, Third Reading
118.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Dunn	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2478, Third Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
	6:40	Edgar	HB-2478
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Totten)	Discussion
)	
119.		Edgar)	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mudd	
	6:42	Speaker Giorgi	
		Edgar	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
120.		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		REPRESENTATIVE MADIGAN IN CHAIR.....	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2480, Third Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		McBroom	Sponsor
		Speaker Madigan	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2481, Third Reading
		Winchester	Hold...TOOR
		Speaker Madigan	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2482, Third Reading
121.		Speaker Madigan	
		Martin	Sponsor HB-2482
		Speaker Madigan	
		Leverenz)	
)	
		Martin, L.)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Skinner)	
)	
		Martin, L.)	
		Speaker Madigan	
122.		Leverenz)	
)	
		Martin, L.)	
	6:48	Speaker Madigan	
123.		Houlihan, Jas.)	
)	
		Martin, L.)	
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Davis, C.)	
)	
124.		Martin, L.)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Polk	Moves previous question
		Speaker Madigan	MPQ moved.
		Martin, L.	To close
		Speaker Madigan	
126.		Matijevich	
		Speaker Madigan	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2484, First Supp. Calendar
		Speaker Madigan	
		Stuffle	Supports
		Speaker Madigan	
127.		Ebbesen	How long in Session?
		Speaker Madigan	Passed. Remain in Session 8:15 or 8:30 Reduction veto motion
	7:00	Clerk O'Brien	HB-750
		Ryan	TOOR
	7:01	Speaker Madigan	TOOR...HB-973
128.		Gaines	
129.		Speaker Madigan	Leave to take all 10 items at one time granted.
		Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
130.		Peters	Sustain veto
		Speaker Madigan	
131.	7:09	Davis, C.	May be last speech....!!!



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	7:15	Speaker Madigan	
134.		Gaines	Explain vote.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Deuster	Explain vote.
135.		Speaker Madigan	
		Dyer	Explain vote.
		Speaker Madigan	Telcser requests verification
	7:21	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Madigan	
136.		Clerk O'Brien	Polls affirmative
137.		Speaker Madigan)	Questions of affirmative
		Telcser)	
138.		Clerk O'Brien	
		Pechous	How recorded
		Speaker Madigan	
		Sandquist	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	Change to 'present'.
		Mulcahey	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	not voting
		Mautino	'aye'
139.		Speaker Madigan)	Items restored
)	Registers dissent on Breslin's
		Collins)	vote....



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	HB-2381..Veto motions
140.		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, Ralph	Urges 'aye' vote.
	7:30	Speaker Madigan	
		Cunningham	
141		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	Close
142.		Speaker Madigan	
		Matijevich	Explains vote.
	7:43	Speaker Madigan	
143.		Geo-Karis	Explains vote.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, R.	Explains vote.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan	Verify
		Speaker Madigan	93 'ayes'; 51 'noes'; 1 'present'
	7:46	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Madigan	
144.		Clerk O'Brien	Verification of Roll Call
		Speaker Madigan	
		Waddell	How recorded
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Waddell	'No'
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues verification
145.		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
145.		Speaker Madigan)	Questions..Affirmative Roll Call
)	
146.		Ryan)	
)	
147.		Clerk O'Brien)	
		Bradley	Leave to place on PPC
		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted; Motion to restore HB-2379
		McClain	HB-2379, inquiry to TOOR
	8:00	Speaker Madigan	Prerogative of Sponsor
148.		Speaker Madigan	Reduction ..Item Veto Motion
		McBroom	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Madigan	
		Van Duyne	TOOR
		McBroom	Question on VanDuyne's motion
		Speaker Madigan	
		McBroom	Suggestion
		Speaker Madigan	TOOR..Proceed toward Adj. 2nd Supplem. Calendar. HB-2479
149.		Bradley	Rule 33 (a) Suspend
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	Object
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	2nd Reading; 2nd Leg. Day
		Speaker Madigan)	Motion carries
)	
		Walsh)	
)	
150.		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2479, 2nd R.; no C.A.
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	Third Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bradley	Question
		Speaker Madigan)	
		McClain)	SB-1385
	8:07	O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	
151.		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2515, First Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		McClain	Bypass Comm. 2nd R.; 2nd Leg. D.
		Speaker Madigan)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	SB-1385, 2nd R., No C.A.
		Speaker Madigan	Third Reading
		Von Boeckman	Anno.; Room C-1 Motor Vehicle Comm.
152.		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	Move to adjourn
		Speaker Madigan	Moved
		Houlihan	
	8:12	Speaker Madigan	Regular Session Adjourned
153.		FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	
	8:12	Speaker Madigan	First called to order
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-37, First Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	HB-26
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	Leave Sponsorship
		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	8:14	Houlihan) Speaker Madigan)	Don't act precipitously
154.			Adjourn First Special Session
			SECOND SPECIAL SESSION CALLED TO ORDER...
155.	8:15	Speaker Madigan	Second Special Session
		Clerk O'Brien	Message from Senate
		Speaker Madigan	
		Jacobs	Unanimous consent
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB-6, First Reading
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Madigan)	
156.		Ryan)	
		Speaker Madigan	Jacobs' motion carries
		Jacobs	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	Moves adjourn
	8:18	Speaker Madigan	Adjourned.....

